

Mediaeval Studies

Volume 64

2002



Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

The Fellows of the Pontifical Institute constitute
the Editorial Board of *Mediaeval Studies*.

Editorial Committee

Jonathan Black, Managing Editor and Chair
James K. Farge Ron B. Thomson

© 2002 by

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
59 Queen's Park Crescent East
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5S 2C4

This volume has been published with aid from
a grant from the Social Sciences
and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

The editing of this volume is supported by
a grant from the Knights of Columbus.

ISBN 0-88844-666-7
ISSN 0076-5872

Printed by
UNIVERSA—WETTEREN—BELGIUM

CONTENTS

TEXTS

Psalm Uses in Carolingian Prayerbooks: Alcuin and the Preface to *De psalmorum usu* *Jonathan Black* 1

Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (VII): The Biblical Anthology from York Minster Library (MS. XVI Q 14) *Greti Dinkova-Bruun* 61

ARTICLES

Henry of Ghent's Teaching on Modes and Its Influence in the Fourteenth Century *Isabel Iribarren* 111

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 16483: Contents, Audience, and the Matter of Old French *Christopher J. McDonough* 131

Ps.-Albert the Great on the Physiognomy of Jesus and Mary *Irven M. Resnick* 217

True Presence/False Christ: The Antinomies of Embodiment in Medieval Spirituality *Dyan Elliott* 241

Kings, Bishops, and Political Ethics: Bruno of Segni on the Cardinal Virtues *István Bejczy* 267

Benvenuto da Imola's Literary Approach to Virgil's *Eclogues* *Mary Louise Lord* 287

PSALM USES IN CAROLINGIAN PRAYERBOOKS:
ALCUIN AND THE PREFACE TO
DE PSALMORUM USU^{*}

Jonathan Black

ALCUIN'S role in the Carolingian reforms has been constantly reassessed and at times reasserted during the past century, as scholars have challenged or defended his supposed authorship of significant works in various areas. One such area is private devotion—nonliturgical worship practiced by members of the clergy, monastic communities, or the laity. In a 1936 article, André Wilmart determined that *De psalmorum usu* and *Officia per ferias*, two major collections of private devotion printed in the editions of Alcuin's works, were in fact compiled during the half-century after Alcuin's death in 804.¹ Wilmart did, however, regard Alcuin as the author of a short text,

* Research for this article was conducted with the assistance of a 1990–92 Postdoctoral Fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Earlier research for this study was conducted at the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library in Collegeville, Minnesota.

¹ André Wilmart, "Le manuel de prières de saint Jean Gualbert," *Revue bénédictine* 48 (1936): 263–65.

De psalmorum usu had been first printed by Adrianus Aernstpergius, under the title *Alcuinus de psalmorum usu, hominum necessitatibus quotidie emergentibus accommodato, una cum variis precandi formulis* (Cologne, 1571); A. Duchesne (Quercetanus) included the work in his edition of Alcuin's *Opera* (Paris, 1617), cols. 123–78, using a Douai edition of 1571 as his source (according to his table of contents); and Froben included it in his edition of Alcuin's *Opera*, 2 vols. (Regensburg, 1777), 2:21–51 (reprinted in PL 101:465–508), using the Aernstpergius and Duchesne editions, but he changed the order of some sections on the basis of certain cues in the early editions suggesting such a rearrangement (see *ibid.* 2:3–4 [PL 101:442]). Wilmart, "Le manuel," 259–99 *passim*, showed that nearly all the material in the edited collection *De psalmorum usu* appears, with additional prayers, in two manuscripts from Nonantola written in the second half of the ninth century (Rome, Biblioteca nazionale centrale Sessoriana 71 and 95), and he suggested that these manuscripts and editions represent a collection of private devotion compiled in Italy in the mid-ninth century (*ibid.*, 265).

Officia per ferias was first printed by Duchesne (*Opera*, cols. 177–270), who took the title from an entry in John Bale's list of Alcuin's works (*Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae catalogus*, 2 vols. [Basel, 1557–59], 1:111); Froben included the collection in his edition of Alcuin's *Opera* (2:52–126; PL 101:509–612), inserting one of Alcuin's letters at the beginning and a verse oration at the end. On the manuscript sources of these editions, see nn. 46 and 63 below.

printed as the preface to *De psalmorum usu*, describing the mysteries and virtues of the psalms and prescribing specific psalms for eight uses: when one wishes (1) to do penance, (2) to pray, or (3) to praise God; in times of (4) temptation, (5) world-weariness, (6) tribulation, or (7) regained prosperity; and (8) when one wishes to contemplate divine laws.² These eight groups of psalms do not correspond to the groups of psalms presented with personal prayers in the body of *De psalmorum usu*, but the same groups do appear in *Officia per ferias* (albeit scattered among other groups of psalms and prayers), and Wilmart concluded that *Officia per ferias* and several other prayerbooks from the ninth century or later are based on Alcuin's short text.³

In this text—now commonly known as the preface to *De psalmorum usu* but often entitled *De laude psalmorum* or *De virtutibus psalmorum* in the manuscript tradition—psalms to be recited in each of the eight circumstances are simply listed by incipit, thus providing a mere outline of a program of devotion. In the prayerbooks that seem to be based on this outline, each of the listed psalms is accompanied by *capitula* (a series of verses from other psalms) and a Psalter collect (a short oration based on the present psalm), and each of the eight psalm groups appears with additional material, such as an opening prayer or a final litany. The full program of psalm uses with *capitula*, collects, and prayers in these Carolingian prayerbooks will be presented in a subsequent study, but the aim of the present article is to present a critical edition of the short text that Wilmart regarded as Alcuin's, preceded by a discussion of its authorship, its textual tradition, and the process by which the psalm uses outlined in it developed into extant prayerbooks such as *Officia per ferias*. This will not only help us evaluate Alcuin's contribution to private devotion in the Middle Ages but will also bring to light certain problems in tex-

² Froben inserted labels for nine uses in the preface, but his "Nonus usus" (*Opera* 2:22; PL 101:467) is simply a label for the concluding section of the preface, on the use of the Psalter as a whole.

For Wilmart's attribution of the preface to Alcuin, see "Le manuel," 263. Pierre Riché, noting the usage of this text in Dhuoda's *Liber manualis* (ca. 842), wrote, "Cette citation prouve que, contrairement à ce que pensait dom Wilmart, cet ouvrage [i.e., *De psalmorum usu*] n'a pas été composé en 850 pour des moines italiens" ("Les bibliothèques de trois aristocrates laïcs carolingiens," *Le moyen âge* 69 [1963]: 94); see also the introduction to Dhuoda, *Manuel pour mon fils*, ed. Pierre Riché, 2d ed., Sources chrétiennes 225 bis (Paris, 1991), 35. Wilmart, however, was referring to the body of *De psalmorum usu* when he made the statement in question (see above at n. 1); he accepted Alcuin's authorship of the preface to *De psalmorum usu*—the only part of the collection used by Dhuoda—and in fact recognized Dhuoda's utilization of it ("Le manuel," 263–64 n. 4). For more on the authorship of the preface, see below.

³ Wilmart, "Le manuel," 264. Froben had already observed this correspondence and suggested that the preface to *De psalmorum usu* was originally intended as a preface to *Officia per ferias* (see *Opera* 2:4; PL 101:442–43).

tual transmission and allow us to trace the evolution of a clearly defined prayerbook tradition from Alcuin's time to the middle of the ninth century, when the flourishing of private devotion led to the compilation of some of the most monumental prayerbooks of the early Middle Ages.⁴

THE AUTHORSHIP AND COMPOSITION OF THE TEXT

The continued popularity of the text edited here is attested by the number of manuscripts that contain it. There are at least 200 extant manuscripts from the ninth to fifteenth centuries containing the text, which has come down to us in versions of different length, with various titles and incipits.⁵ It is ascribed to Augustine in about a third of the manuscripts and to Jerome in several others, and it often appears as an anonymous text, but in one of the late ninth-century Nonantola manuscripts presenting this text as the preface to the prayerbook known as *De psalmorum usu*, the title *De laude psalmorum* is preceded immediately by the inscription "Hoc opus, hoc carmen, quod cernis tramite lector, Alcuinus domini fecit honore sui".⁶ It is apparently for this reason that *De psalmorum usu* as a whole was printed under Alcuin's name. Wilmart determined that Alcuin could not have been responsible for the body of that collection, but he accepted Alcuin's authorship of the preface without stating his reasons.⁷ There is, however, evidence supporting Wilmart's assertion that Alcuin is the author of *De laude psalmorum*.

⁴ Certain lines of this development have been documented by Jean-Baptiste Molin, "Les manuscrits de la 'Deprecatio Gelasii': Usage privé des psaumes et dévotion aux litanies," *Ephemerides liturgicae* 90 (1976): 113–48. In this article Molin describes the contents of six manuscripts, all located in Paris, representing successive degrees to which Alcuin's psalm uses were transformed and supplemented: Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF) lat. 1154, 11550, 1248, 2731A, 13388, and 1153, and Bibliothèque Mazarine 512 (the "Deprecatio Gelasii," a litany that appears in three of these manuscripts, serves just as the starting point for the article, which is devoted almost entirely to the psalm uses). These manuscripts and others will be included in the discussion and edition below. In "The Daily Cursus, the Week, and the Psalter in the Divine Office and Carolingian Devotion" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1987), 324–60, I have discussed the psalm uses in the Paris manuscripts in terms of their significance as programs of private devotion that coexisted with the use of the psalms in the liturgy.

⁵ See pp. 36–43 below for a provisional list of manuscripts, grouped by the respective incipits of the different versions.

⁶ Rome, Biblioteca nazionale centrale Sessoriana 71, fol. 32r. The various titles (with or without attributions) in many of the other manuscripts containing *De laude psalmorum* are indicated in the list on pp. 36–43 below.

⁷ See n. 2 above. Riché (Dhuoda, *Manuel*, 35 and 360–61 n. 1) leaves the question of Alcuin's authorship open. Donald A. Bullough indicated that it "is probably from Alcuin's pen" in "Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven: Liturgy, Theology, and the Carolingian Age," in *Carolingian Essays*, ed. Uta-Renate Blumenthal (Washington, D.C., 1983), 20 and n. 41, reprinted

One indication that Alcuin wrote the text is its inclusion of a passage found in a letter that Alcuin wrote to Arno of Salzburg in 802: “Nullus mortalium virtutem psalmorum pleniter explicare poterit.”⁸ In *De laude psalmorum*, the passage appears in most manuscripts as “Nullus itaque mortalium potest . . . virtutem psalmorum . . . explicare,”⁹ and, as will be seen below, there is evidence in the manuscript tradition that the passage may have originally appeared exactly as it appears in Alcuin’s letter, along with the subsequent phrases of the letter. The shared passage seems to be not the result of an anonymous author using Alcuin’s letter but rather an instance of a formula being reused by the same author, since it appears yet again later in *De laude psalmorum* adapted to another context, referring to the *hymnus trium puerorum* (the canticle *Benedicite*) instead of the psalms: “Nullus itaque mortalium virtutem huius hymni explicare potest.”¹⁰

Another indication is provided by the Life of Alcuin, written before 829, which describes Alcuin’s instruction of Charlemagne in the following terms:

he also taught him which psalms of penance to sing all his life with litany, collects, and *preces*; which psalms to sing for special prayer; which ones to sing in praise of God; which ones to sing for any tribulation; and which psalm to sing in order to occupy himself in divine praises.¹¹

in D. A. Bullough, *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (Manchester, 1991), 173 and n. 43 (in a passage repeated nearly verbatim by Michael S. Driscoll in “The Seven Penitential Psalms: Their Designation and Usages from the Middle Ages Onwards,” *Ecclesia Orans* 17 [2000]: 179); but in “Alcuin’s Cultural Influence: The Evidence of the Manuscripts,” in *Alcuin of York: Scholar of the Carolingian Court*, ed. L. A. J. R. Houwen and A. A. MacDonald, *Germania Latina III*, *Mediaevalia Groningana* 22 (Groningen, 1998), 2 n. 4, Bullough states that he is not entirely convinced of Alcuin’s authorship.

⁸ Alcuin, Ep. 243, in *Epistolae Karolini Aevi* 2, ed. E. Dümmeler, *MGH Epistolae* 4 (Berlin, 1895), 391. The letter is the preface to Alcuin’s commentary on the penitential psalms, Ps 118, and the gradual psalms. (All psalm references follow the numbering used in the two Latin versions cited in this study, the *Psalterium Romanum* [*Rom*] and the *Gallicanum* or *Vulgate Psalter* [*Gall*]).

⁹ See the edition below (col. a), lines 115–19.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, lines 228–29. There are also other phrases in Alcuin’s letter with parallels in *De laude psalmorum* that could be regarded as formulaic variations written by the same author: cf. “In his confessiones peccatorum . . . excitantur. . . . Quicumque psalmos intenta mente decantare et scrutari didicit, inveniet . . .” (Ep. 243, p. 391) and “In psalmis invenies . . . si intenta mente perscruteris . . . intimam confessionem peccatorum tuorum” (*De laude psalmorum*, lines 125–30). At a later point in Alcuin’s commentary, in the short preface to Ps 118, there is another parallel: cf. “continentur in eo lex, mandata, justificationes, testimonia, judicia” (*Expositio in Ps 118*, *praef.*, PL 101:597) and “nullus versus est in quo non sit vel via Dei, vel lex vel mandatum seu praeceptum Dei, vel verba aut iustificationes” (*De laude psalmorum*, lines 239–43), but here Alcuin was using an earlier text, the preface to Ps 118 in the *Breviarium in psalmos* of Ps.-Jerome (PL 26:1187 [1258 alt. ed.]).

¹¹ “. . . docuit etiam eum per omne vitae sue tempus, quos psalmos poenitentiae cum leta-

This description attributes to Alcuin what appears to be the first, second, third, sixth (or perhaps fourth), and eighth psalm uses; the remaining uses may have been omitted merely because they do not lend themselves to such concise designations. Yet these particular designations suggest that this description of psalm uses is not a reference to the *De laude psalmorum* but rather a reference to a program of devotion derived from it: the terms used to designate the second and third uses are almost identical to the *tituli* for these uses in the later prayerbooks (“Ad orationes speciales faciendas” and “Ad laudem Dei”), whereas *De laude psalmorum* presents these uses in quite different terms (“Si vis orare . . .” and “Si vis omnipotentem Deum laudare . . .”).¹² Furthermore, the *vita* mentions a litany with *orationes* and *preces*: these pertain to components of the psalm uses in the prayerbooks but are not mentioned in *De laude psalmorum*. Nevertheless, the *vita* shows that in the decades after his death Alcuin was associated with the psalm uses, which were first outlined in *De laude psalmorum*.

The only difficulty with the attribution of the work to Alcuin is the deficient quality of its composition, at least as it appears in the earliest attested version that has come to us, preserved in manuscripts written from the early ninth century through the later Middle Ages. The problem is particularly evident in the opening lines of this version, which begins with five sentences taken from Gregory the Great’s homilies on Ezechiel (but without any attribution that might have prevented the common attribution of *De laude psalmorum* to Augustine). The inclusion of an extended excerpt from a patristic source is certainly consistent with Alcuin’s method of compilation as seen, for instance, in his scriptural commentaries, but in the manuscripts containing this early version of the text, the borrowing does not seem to be the work of an adept compiler. The first two sentences appear as a disjointed excerpt of the source text, which reads as follows in Gregory’s homily:

But sometimes (*Aliquando vero*) the spirit of prophecy is not present in prophets and is not always ready in their (*eorum*) minds, to the extent that when they do not have it they recognize that when they do have it they have it as a gift. Thus Elisha—when . . . Jehoshaphat asked him about the future, and the spirit of

nia et orationibus precibusque, quos ad orationem specialem faciendam, quos in laude Dei, quos quoque pro quacumque tribulatione, quemque etiam, ut se in divinis exerceret laudibus, decantaret” (*Vita Alcuini* 15, ed. W. Arndt, MGH SS 15.1 [Hannover, 1887], 193). On the date of the *vita*, see Donald Bullough, “Alcuino e la tradizione culturale insulare,” in *I problemi dell’Occidente nel secolo VIII*, vol. 2, Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo 20 (Spoleto, 1973), 577–82, and “Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven,” 2 (rpt. 161–62).

¹² See the edition below (col. a), lines 156 and 171–72; for the *tituli* in the later prayerbooks, see p. 32 below.

prophecy was not with him (*ei . . . deesset*)—called for the psaltery to be played so that the spirit of prophecy would descend upon him through psalmodic praise and fill his mind with things to come (cf. 2 Kings [4 Reg] 3:15).¹³

This is excerpted as follows at the beginning of *De laude psalmorum* in the version that has come down to us in the earliest extant manuscripts:

Also since [?] (*Quia etiam*) the spirit of prophecy is not always ready in their (*eorum*) minds, to the extent that when they do not have it they recognize that when they do have it they have it as a gift. Thus, when the prophet Elisha was asked about the future and knew the spirit of prophecy was not with him (*ei . . . deesse agnovit*), he called for the psaltery to be played so that the spirit of prophecy would descend upon him. . . (col. a, lines 83–92).

The pronouns from Gregory's text have been retained, even though “*eorum*” no longer has an explicit referent and “*ei*” now refers to the subject of the clause. The hanging “*Quia etiam*” might also be an infelicitous imitation of Gregory's text, which later in the same paragraph has the following sentence:

Moreover, the fact that (*Quia autem*) the spirit of prophecy is not always present with prophets is also (*etiam*) indicated by the man of God who . . . was deceived by the persuasion of a false prophet, whose lie would not have deceived him if he had the spirit of prophecy present (cf. 1 Kings [3 Reg] 13).¹⁴

In many manuscripts these problems pertaining to the composition of the text are less apparent, since the words “*Quia etiam*” are excluded, “*prophetarum*” is specified in place of “*eorum*,” and “*sibi*” is used in place of “*ei*.” Could these manuscripts, which include the late ninth-century manuscript that attributes the text to Alcuin (see n. 6 above), be regarded as better representatives of the original compilation? A textual comparison of the different versions in the extant manuscripts suggests that this is not the case, and the possibility that the readings “*Quia etiam*,” “*eorum*,” and “*ei*” were taken from Gregory during the original compilation of the text and emended at some point in the manuscript tradition seems more likely than the possibility that these problematic readings were introduced to the tradition later by contamination from the Gregorian source. But is it likely, then, that Alcuin could be responsible for such a compilation? A possible solution is that Alcuin might

¹³ Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Hiezechihelem prophetam* 1.1.15, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 142 (Turnhout, 1971), 12 (quoted below in the note to lines 83–104 of the edition).

¹⁴ “*Quia autem prophetis prophetiae spiritus non semper adest, etiam uir Dei indicat, qui . . . prophetae falsi persuasione deceptus est, quem fallax sermo non deciperet, si prophetiae spiritum praesentem habuisset*” (*ibid.*, ed. Adriaen, 13); cf. also Gregory's reference to Isaiah's prediction to Hezekiah (Is 38:5) in the sentence immediately preceding “*Aliquando uero prophetiae spiritus . . .*”: “*Qui etiam de Ezechia rege prophetiae spiritu tactus . . . , quia eum de infirmitate sua surgeret praedixit. . .*” (*ibid.* 1.1.14, ed Adriaen, 12).

have taken the words in question from Gregory as part of an even more extensive excerpt and that Alcuin's text had already become corrupted by time of the archetype behind the extant manuscripts.

Other apparent problems in the composition of the text that has come down to us provide further evidence that the versions (with or without "Quia etiam") attested by manuscripts from the ninth century or from subsequent centuries stem from a corrupt archetype, transmitting the original compilation in an incomplete form. For instance, the sentences following the excerpt from Gregory do not form an entirely logical sequence. The passage from Gregory's homily, as it appears in *De laude psalmorum*, concludes,

For when the psalmodic voice is directed by the heart's intent, through this a way to the heart is prepared for the almighty Lord, so that it pours the mysteries of prophecy and grace of compunction into the intent mind. As it is written, "The sacrifice of praise has glorified me," etc. Thus, in sacrifice through divine praise, a way of showing is made (that leads) to Jesus, since while compunction is poured out through psalmody, a path by which we may reach Jesus is made in the heart.¹⁵

This passage, focusing more on the effect of psalmody on the heart (*cor*) than on the mind (*mens*), is followed somewhat abruptly by a sequence of sentences which (apart from individual phrases) have no known source:

It is indeed fitting that while the mind may purify itself from the present as much as possible, it may also cling to divine, celestial, and spiritual things, so that celestial things might be revealed to it. For there is nothing in this mortal life by which we may cling to those above (*superis civibus*; var. *Deo*) more closely than by divine praises. And so, no mortal can explain the power of psalms which are sung not superficially with the lips but rather with an intent mind in praise of the almighty God. And so, if you study the psalms with an intent mind and attain spiritual understanding, you will find in them the incarnation of the Word and the Lord's passion and resurrection and ascension.¹⁶

The last sentence quoted above presents an additional problem, since it reappears at the end of *De laude psalmorum* (after the section on the eight psalm uses) in a slightly modified form but nevertheless in a manner that seems to be as much a redundancy as a recapitulation:

¹⁵ See the edition below (col. a), lines 93–104.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, lines 106–24. As indicated in the apparatus, the opening "Dignum quippe est ut dum mens . . ." appears without *dum* in some versions of the text, slightly changing the sense ("It is indeed fitting that the mind may purify itself . . . and cling . . ."). The phrase, particularly in its alternative form, does have a possible model in Gregory's *Moralia in Job* 3.33.64, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 143 (Turnhout, 1979), 155, where "Dignum quippe est ut sancta mens" is used in an entirely different context.

you will also find in the psalms the incarnation and passion and resurrection and ascension of the Lord and all the power of divine words, if you study them with your innermost mind and attain through the grace of God the marrow of innermost understanding.¹⁷

These problems in the composition of the text are evident throughout the manuscript tradition, except in the truncated versions or excerpts of the text that do not include the sections containing the passages in question, and there is no basis within the manuscript tradition of the text *per se* on which to attempt to go beyond the apparently corrupt archetype and reconstruct a text that might be considered Alcuin's original compilation. There is, however, a group of derived compilations from the later Middle Ages that may give us a very specific indication of the original text, since there is compelling evidence that the fourteenth-century authors of these texts had access to manuscripts of *De laude psalmorum* which were more representative of the original compilation than any of the manuscripts known to us. The authors of these later works incorporating the text of *De laude psalmorum* are Ludolph of Saxony and Ralph of Rivo, and we must present the relevant sections of their respective works and discuss them in some detail in order to show what light they shed on the composition and textual history of *De laude psalmorum*.

The prologue to the psalm commentary written in the mid-fourteenth century by Ludolph of Saxony, O.Cart., begins with several sentences excerpted without ascription from the twelfth-century psalm commentary of Honorius Augustodunensis ("Sicut olim manna habuit *omne* delectamentum . . ."), describing the effect of the psalms sung in choir to offer praise, sung by the just to offer thanks, sung by a sinner to ask for pardon, etc.¹⁸ This is followed by comments on the psalms' effect on the mind ("Utile autem et salubre est intelligere quod nunquam cessamus decantare. Auget quippe deuotionem intelligentia. . . . Dum cogitas psalmos, christus in mente tua est . . .") and a series of statements and scriptural quotations pertaining to the association of psalm singers with the angels ("Psalmorum deuotio presentiam christi conciliat: Angelorum congratulationem generat . . ."), ending with a quotation from Jer 48:10 (*Maledictus omnis qui opus dei facit negligenter*). This leads into the two sentences quoted above that follow the excerpt from Gregory in *De laude psalmorum*—with a notable difference. Instead of recommending

¹⁷ See the edition below (col. a), lines 254–61.

¹⁸ Honorius Augustodunensis, *Expositio in psalmos selectos*, prol. (Nota), PL 172:274. The text of Ludolph quoted here is from *Ludophi Chartus. in Psal. David . . . Enarratio* (n.p., 1542), fol. 1r–v (= fol. 2r–v of the Speier, 1491 *editio princeps*), with slight modifications in the orthography; for a list of manuscripts and editions, see F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium bibliicum medii aevi*, 11 vols. (Madrid, 1950–80), no. 5428.

that the mind purify itself from present things and cling to divine, celestial, and spiritual things, Ludolph's text refers to the mind in terms of psalmody, using phrases from the Benedictine Rule:

It is indeed fitting that “our mind and voice should be in harmony” when “we attend divine service” and that each person diligently withdraw from the present and cling to the divine so that celestial gifts are revealed to the person who does so. For there is nothing in this mortal life by which we may cling to God more closely than by divine praise.¹⁹

Then, after a connecting sentence stating how psalm singing prepares the mind for the Holy Spirit (“Psalmorum deuotio spiritui sancto mentem preparat, et omnium gratiarum dona meretur”), the first five sentences of *De laude psalmorum* are presented, identified correctly as a quotation from Gregory. The quotation is identical to the excerpt that appears without attribution in *De laude psalmorum* except in the opening and final words (“Unde Gregorius. Spiritus dei prophetarum mentibus non semper presto est . . .”; “. . . per quam in fine ad iesum peruenitur. Hec Gregorius”).²⁰ The final phrase is particularly noteworthy, since it uses Gregory's precise words instead of the paraphrase “per quam ad ihesum venimus (veniamus)” found in the manuscripts of *De laude psalmorum*.

Since the two sentences that follow the excerpt from Gregory in *De laude psalmorum* have already appeared before the excerpt in Ludolph's prologue, Ludolph resumes with the third sentence following the excerpt in *De laude psalmorum* (“Nullus itaque mortalium . . .”) and continues to the end but skips over the entire section on the eight psalm uses. There is one other passage in *De laude psalmorum* that is excluded: Ludolph's prologue skips over the first of the two references to the incarnation, passion, resurrection, and ascension in *De laude psalmorum*.

The absence of the section on the eight psalm uses is clearly either a deliberate omission on the part of Ludolph or the result of an omission in the copy of *De laude psalmorum* that he used as a source.²¹ But Ludolph or his

¹⁹ “Dignum quippe est vt mens nostra concordet cum voce quando ad diuinum opus assistimus et cum diligentia a presentibus vniuersis quisque se retrahat : et divinis inhæreat vt celestia ei dona reuelentur. Nihil enim est in hac mortali vita in quo possimus familiarius inherere deo quam in laude divina” (Ludolph, *In psalmos*, prol., 1r). Cf. *Regula Benedicti* 19, ed. R. Hanslik, CSEL 75 (Vienna, 1977): “sic stemus ad psallendum, ut mens nostra concordet uoci nostrae” (82); and “cum ad opus diuinum adsistimus” (81).

²⁰ The version of *De laude psalmorum* in Graz, Universitätsbibliothek 1595 (39/71), fols. 62v–65v, a thirteenth-century Carthusian manuscript, has the same incipit (“Spiritus dei prophetarum mentibus . . .”) but is attributed to Jerome: *Jeronus de virtute et laude psalmorum*.

²¹ The excision of the section was carried out in a logical but not entirely seamless fashion. In *De laude psalmorum*, the paragraph concerning the eighth psalm use describes the compreh-

immediate source is not necessarily responsible for changing the order of the sentences, for identifying and correcting the quotation from Gregory's homily, or for deleting the redundant line. On these points the differences between *De laude psalmorum* as it appears in the extant manuscripts and the excerpts of this text in Ludolph's prologue may be differences that set in more than half a millennium earlier, when the text was first composed. In fact, one of the differences noted above can be traced back at least to the eleventh century: in one of the versions beginning "Quia etiam prophetiae"—and definitely not a version that could have served as Ludolph's source—the sentence beginning "Dignum quippe est" contains the very phrases from the Benedictine Rule that appear in Ludolph's version.²² To assess the possibility that these phrases and some of the other distinctive features of Ludolph's text may go all the way back to the early ninth century, we must take into consideration three texts composed even later than Ludolph's—the liturgical treatises of Ralph of Rivo, dean of Tongres.

The *Liber de canonum observantia* (ca. 1396–97), Ralph of Rivo's collection of *propositiones* addressed to the Augustinian house of Windesheim, was first published in 1568 by Michael Hittorp, who based the edition on a fragmentary manuscript in Cologne and a manuscript owned by Jakob Pamel of Brügge. In his study and critical edition of the liturgical works of Ralph of Rivo, Cunibert Mohlberg had to rely on Hittorp's text for the *Liber de can-*

hensive contents of Ps 118 (see n. 10 above), and concludes "Et ideo non est tibi opus ut per diversos libros animo diffunderis," leading into the final section of the text, on the comprehensive contents of the Psalter as a whole. Ludolph excludes the comments on Ps 118 but retains the last sentence of the paragraph on the eighth psalm use, which now serves to connect the final section *De laude psalmorum* to the last sentence before the section on the psalm uses. The sequence thus reads as follows in Ludolph's text: "... Omnes enim virtutes in psalmis reperies: si a deo merueris ut tibi psalmorum virtutem reuelet. Et ideo non est tibi opus. . . ."

²² Oxford, Bodleian Library D'Orville 45, fol. 34r: "Dignum quippe est ut *mens nostra concordet voci nostrae* quando *ad opus divinum assistimus*, et a praesentibus universis malis, in quantum valet, et divinis et caelestibus atque spiritualibus se inhaerent, ut caelestia dona ei reuelentur" (the italicized phrases follow the Benedictine Rule more closely in this version than in Ludolph's). This late eleventh-century manuscript from Moissac is included in the edition below (siglum *H*). I have not been able to determine whether all the readings in this manuscript also appear in a closely related eleventh-century Moissac manuscript, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV) Rossi 205, which evidently contains the same version of the text; see the description of the two manuscripts by Susan Boynton, "Eleventh-Century Continental Hymnaries Containing Glosses," *Scriptorium* 53 (1999): 222–33, who notes the presence of "Quia etiam prophetiae spiritus . . ." in both manuscripts, pointing out that "Rossi 205 contains additional text that is also in Bodleian D'Orville 45 but is not found in the printed text [PL 101:465–68] or in most other manuscripts" (223 n. 92; this is presumably a reference to the text on fols. 35v–36r of D'Orville 45, beginning "Quamvis textus psalterii," which has been edited by Donatien de Bruyne, *Préfaces de la Bible latine* [Namur, 1920], 112, from two other manuscripts—Paris, BnF lat. 13143 and Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève 1177).

num observantia, since no manuscripts could be found containing the text; although Mohlberg identified Hittorp's Cologne manuscript with the manuscript now in the Historisches Archiv, GB 4° 174 (s. XIV ex.), he determined that it represents an earlier work by Ralph of Rivo entitled *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis*.²³ Mohlberg included both works in his edition along with a third work, the *Tractatus de psalterio observando* (ca. 1400), found in Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 1996-2000, and he noted that all three works contains a section based on Alcuin's preface to *De psalmorum usu* (PL 101:465-68) but in substantially different forms which seem to be derived from different versions of Alcuin's text—either directly or through the intermediary of Ludolph's prologue.²⁴

From a textual comparison of the three texts in Mohlberg's edition along with the Ludolph text and manuscripts representing the various versions of *De laude psalmorum*, several observations and inferences can be made. For the text beginning “Prophetiae spiritus” and included in chapter 7 of the *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis*, Ralph simply incorporated an existing version of *De laude psalmorum*; although it omits a number of phrases and sentences found in other versions of the text, Ralph is not responsible for these cuts, since they are also found in other manuscripts containing this version dating back at least to the thirteenth century.²⁵ The text is followed by an excerpt from Honorius Augustodunensis beginning “Psalterium non exteriori, sed interior homini loquitur . . .” and containing “Sicut olim manna habuit omne delectamentum . . .,” the passage used at the beginning of Ludolph's prologue.

“Sicut olim manna habuit omne delectamentum . . .” also appears in Ralph's other works, but there the excerpt is not taken directly from Honorius; the first

²³ Cunibert Mohlbert, *Rudolph de Rivo: Der letzte Vertreter der altrömischen Liturgie*, vol. 1: *Studien* (Louvain, 1911); vol. 2: *Texte* (Münster i. W., 1915). For the *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis*, see 1:111-18 and 2:1-33; and for the *Liber de canonum observantia*, see 1:67-86 and 2:34-156. In vol. 1, Mohlberg merely considers the possibility that the manuscript of the *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis* in the Historisches Archiv may be the fragmentary manuscript from the Cologne Kreuzkloster that Hittorp used in his edition of the *Liber de canonum observantia*, but in his introduction to vol. 2 (p. x) he leaves no doubt that it is the same manuscript.

²⁴ For the *Tractatus de psalterio observando*, see *ibid.* 1:95-110 and 2:157-280. For Mohlberg's comments on the differences between the versions, see esp. the apparatus to the *Liber de canonum observantia* on 2:56-57.

²⁵ Five manuscripts known to me contain this abbreviated version, which ends “. . . tractatos atque descriptos” (omitting the final sentence of the more widely attested “Prophetiae spiritus . . . perveneris” version printed in PL 101:465-68): Basel, Universitätsbibliothek B.VII.30, fols. 33vb-34ra (s. XIII); Cologne, Historisches Archiv W 117, fols. 138v-139r (s. xv); Graz, Universitätsbibliothek 394, fol. 111r-v; Vatican City, BAV Reg. lat. 121, fols. 11v-12r (s. XIV); and Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka 217 (I.F.190), fols. 213v-214v. The Vatican manuscript, a late medieval prayerbook containing diverse devotional material from the early Middle Ages, is included in the edition below (siglum F).

part of *propositio* 9 of the *Liber de canonum observantia* and the entire chapter 12 of *De psalterio observando* corresponds to the prologue of Ludolph's psalm commentary, including the placement of "Dignum quippe est . . ." (with the phrases from the Benedictine Rule) before the quotation from Gregory. The correspondence, however, does not extend into the next part of *propositio* 9 or into chapter 13 of *De psalterio observando*, where the text of *De laude psalmorum* continues; for the eight psalm uses, which Ludolph omits, the *Liber de canonum observantia* presents the abbreviated version found in the *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis*, and *De psalterio observantia* presents a different version.

For our study of the textual history of *De laude psalmorum*, the text of the *Liber de canonum observantia* is of little value. It contains no readings that are not also attested in one of Ralph's other works, and we do not know whether the agreement with the *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis* is due to Hit-torp's use of the Cologne manuscript or whether he found those readings in his other source as well. *De psalterio observando*, by contrast, provides valuable information for the textual history of *De laude psalmorum*. Since Ralph includes a more extensive version of the text than the one in Ludolph—including a complete section on the psalm uses that Ralph could not have taken from the version he had incorporated in the earlier *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis*—and since even the corresponding sections of Ralph's and Ludolph's texts diverge in a few instances, it is evident that chapters 12 and 13 of *De psalterio observando* are based not on Ludolph's prologue directly but rather on a source closely related to the one that Ludolph had used.

If Ludolph and Ralph independently based their texts on existing versions of *De laude psalmorum*, what is the origin of these versions with the distinctive placement of "Dignum quippe est . . ." before the quotation from Gregory? Through a comparison of Ludolph's text with the text attested in ninth-century manuscripts, we have already seen that the fourteenth-century text is more coherent in several respects may perhaps be considered a better representative of the sort of compilation that Alcuin might have produced. Ralph's *De psalterio observando* provides a further indication that the fourteenth-century texts may preserve readings from Alcuin's compilation not found in the ninth-century manuscripts. In place of the "Nullus mortalium" passage mentioned above, with phrases found in Alcuin's letter to Arno, Ralph's text contains more extended excerpts from the letter, using Alcuin's exact words. The corresponding sentences from the beginning of *De psalterio observando* 13, from Ludolph's prologue, and from the manuscripts of *De laude psalmorum* are listed below, with the words from Alcuin's letter in italics:

Ralph of Rivo

Nullus mortalium virtutem psalmorum pleniter explicare poterit [. . .], nam totus psalmorum liber caelestibus redolet mysteriis, spiritualibus abundat praeceptis, divinis repletus est laudibus.

Ludolph of Saxony

Nullus itaque mortalium potest vel verbo explicare: vel animo comprehendere psalmorum virtutem: si non superficie labiorum tantum sed intenta mente et puro corde in diuina laude canantur.

De laude psalmorum MSS²⁶

Nullus itaque mortalium potest nec verbis nec (var. potest verbis aut) mente virtutem psalmorum, quae non superficie labiorum [tantum] sed intenta mente [et puro corde] in omnipotentis dei laude cantatur (var. canitur; canantur), explicare.

As Ralph is not known to have used Alcuin's letters or other works as direct sources,²⁷ there is no reason to suspect that he replaced the sentence in his source with a direct quotation from Alcuin's letter. While it is possible that the passage had been introduced to a source behind Ralph's text (for instance, noted as a marginal parallel and subsequently incorporated into the text), it is equally possible that Alcuin used the same passage in his letter and in *De laude psalmorum*, a passage replaced in the other versions as a result of a common source or through contamination. Although there is no conclusive evidence that the sentence as it appears in the manuscript tradition *De laude psalmorum* replaced the sentence preserved in Ralph's text, a development along these lines would be consistent with the other major development suggested above: if the "Dignum quippe est" sentence preserved in Ludolph's and Ralph's text (with its phrases from the Benedictine Rule and its simple ending "[ut quisque] divinis inhaereat, ut caelestia ei dona revelentur") was moved and transformed in the more widely attested sentence (ending "[ut mens] divinis, caelestibus [var.: divinis laudibus] atque spiritualibus se inhaereat, ut ei caelestibus dona revelantur"), the resulting reference to the divine, celestial, and spiritual things—or, in some manuscripts, divine praises and spiritual things—may be seen as a vestige of Alcuin's reference to celestial mysteries, spiritual precepts, and divine praies in the suppressed part of the original "Nullus mortalium" sentence.

²⁶ The readings from the consensus of early manuscripts are given with variants noted parenthetically. The additions in square brackets are from the eleventh-century manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library D'Orville 45, fol. 34r, which, as noted above (n. 22), shares certain readings with the versions used by Ludolph and Ralph but cannot be regarded as a direct or indirect source for them.

²⁷ Apart from the references to the *De psalmorum usu* preface, there are no entries for Alcuin in the source indexes to Mohlberg's edition of Ralph's liturgical works, and the only historical references to Alcuin in Ralph's works are in passages borrowed from another source.

There is one other feature of Ralph's version of the text in *De psalterio observando* that should be noted here. It has already been seen that Ludolph's text excludes the first of the two references to the incarnation, passion, resurrection, and ascension that appear in the most extensive versions of *De laude psalmorum*. Ralph's text includes the passages that Ludolph omits but excludes the redundant reference at the end of the text. To suppose that the original text had both passages would mean that Ludolph and Ralph—or their respective sources—devised two different methods of eliminating the apparent redundancy; it is more likely that the original text had just the one reference and the process of transposing it to the end of the text, as in Ludolph's version, resulted in a doublet that entered the manuscript tradition.

In the preceding study of the authorship, composition, and textual tradition of *De laude psalmorum*, we have seen that there is evidence to support the attribution of this text to Alcuin in the Sessoriana 71 manuscript of the edited prayerbook entitled *De psalmorum usu* (insofar as the attribution pertains just to the preface of the prayerbook in that manuscript). But we have raised serious doubts about the extent to which Alcuin's original compilation would have resembled the version that appears in that manuscript and numerous others ("Prophetiae spiritus . . . perveneris"). Other versions, beginning "Quia etiam prophetiae spiritus" and found in the earliest manuscripts containing the text, seem to preserve traces of the author's early attempt to incorporate a passage from Gregory the Great's homilies on Ezechiel; and there is evidence of a substantially different composition—at least partially preserved in late medieval texts derived from it—with the excerpt from Gregory clearly set off and identified as part of a more coherent text that better reflects Alcuin's method of compilation.²⁸

These considerations make it impossible to present an edition of Alcuin's text in its original form. It cannot be reconstructed from the versions in the extant manuscripts, and even if we were to consider that chapters 12 and 13 of Ralph of Rivo's *De psalterio observando* might possibly preserve Alcuin's text in its entirety, we would not be able to determine the exact point at which Alcuin's text begins. The first passage known to be from *De laude psalmorum* is preceded in chapter 12, as in Ludolph's text, by some passages that seem to be integral parts of the same text and others that are evidently taken from Honorius Augustodunensis or based on other twelfth-century sources. Never-

²⁸ Not only is Alcuin's competence as a compiler better reflected in the flow and sense of Ludolph's and Ralph's versions than in the early manuscripts, but the identification of Gregory by name is also consistent with Alcuin's method of compilation. See, for instance, Alcuin's reference to the same work in *Contra Felicem Urgellitanum* 1.11 (PL 101:136): "Unde et beatus Gregorius in quadam homilia in Ezechielem prophetam . . ."

theless, for the purpose of our study of the psalm uses in Carolingian prayerbooks, the extant manuscripts provide an adequate basis on which to present a critical edition of the text. The version that served as the basis for the ninth-century prayerbooks is edited below with a critical apparatus showing the readings from ninth- to eleventh-century manuscripts representing various versions of the text that began to circulate in the decades following Alcuin's death; and to provide an indication of Alcuin's original text as well as an illustration of its utilization in the later Middle Ages, the corresponding sections of Ralph's *De psalterio observando* are printed in a parallel column, with variants from Ludolph's prologue indicated in the notes. Before explaining the sigla used in the edition and accounting for the principles used in establishing the text, however, we must turn to the prayerbook traditions based on or associated with Alcuin's text.

THE EIGHT PSALM USES IN CAROLINGIAN PRAYERBOOKS

The numerous copies of *De laude psalmorum* or extracts from the text in extant manuscripts produced during the course of the Middle Ages not only indicate the popularity of the text but also attest to the existence of several different versions, some of which date back to the decades following Alcuin's death. In early ninth-century manuscripts from monastic centers associated with Alcuin and his circle we have two versions of the text beginning "Quia etiam prophetiae spiritus" which are substantially the same but have a notable difference at the break between the descriptions of the first and second psalm uses. The version in the ninth-century section of Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 1008 (siglum A in the edition below), from Salzburg,²⁹ ends the description of use 1 and begins the description of use 2 as follows:

... [sing the seven penitential psalms] and you will find that God's immediate clemency will illuminate your entire mind with spiritual joy and gladness and promise you great hope of God's indulgence. If you wish to pray. . .³⁰

The final statements pertaining to use 1 are placed at the beginning of the

²⁹ In this composite manuscript, s. IX–XII, *De laude psalmorum* appears on fol. 186r–188r, in one of the earlier hands (s. IX in.), a late example of the Salzburg "Stil I" (see Bernhard Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, vol. 2: *Die vorwiegend österreichischen Diözesen* [Wiesbaden, 1980], 94).

³⁰ "... et caelerrimam invenies clementiam dei totam mentem spiritali gaudio ac laetitia inluminare et magnam spem dei indulgentiae tibi promittere" (fol. 187r). See the edition below for readings in the other manuscripts containing this version; and cf. the more direct passage preserved in Ralph of Rivo's *De psalterio observando* 13.

description of use 2 in the other version, which is found in Vatican City, BAV Reg. lat. 140 (siglum *G*), a monastic miscellany from Fleury:³¹

... [sing the seven penitential psalms] and you will quickly find God's clemency. If you wish to have your mind illuminated with spiritual joy and gladness, and for great hope that God's indulgence will be promised to you [?], and if you wish to pray. . . .³²

The latter also appears in the version beginning “*Prophetiae spiritus*” that served as the preface to *De psalmorum usu* (sigla *I* and *J*) and is also found—either on its own or in conjunction with another Ps.-Augustinian preface, “*Canticum psalmorum animas decorat . . .*”—in numerous manuscripts throughout the Middle Ages.³³ The arrangement in the Vienna manuscript had an equally long following, as it not only appears in other manuscripts containing this version (see sigla *B*, *C*, *D*, and *E*) but is also found in a shorter version of *De laude psalmorum* that circulated from the ninth century to the end of the Middle Ages. This shorter version, beginning “*Si vis pro peccatis tuis paenitentiam agere*,” contains just the section on the eight psalm uses

³¹ See A. Wilmart, *Codices Reginenses Latini*, 2 vols. (Vatican, 1937–45), 1:337–42; *De laude psalmorum* appears on fols. 106v–108v, immediately before Alcuin’s Ep. 131, *Ad pueros sancti Martini de confessione peccatorum*; this, however, is not one of the manuscripts used by Dümmler in his critical edition of the letter, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi* 2:193–98, and Michael S. Driscoll does not refer to it in “*Ad pueros sancti Martini*: A Critical Edition, English Translation, and Study of the Manuscript Transmission” *Traditio* 53 (1998): 37–61 (also printed in *Alcuin et la pénitence à l'époque carolingienne* [Münster, 1999], 181–96)—an expanded copy of the MGH edition in which Driscoll simply adds readings from four manuscripts to those in Dümmler’s apparatus, retaining the original sigla for the other manuscripts but erroneously designating Dümmler’s siglum *I* (=Ivrea, Biblioteca capitolare 16 [XXX]) as a York manuscript, perhaps through a confusion of Eporediensis and Eboracensis.

³² “. . . et celerrime invenies clementiam dei. Si vis mentem tuam spiritali gaudio ac laetitia inluminare et magnam spem dei indulgentiam tibi promittere. Et si vis orare” (fol. 107v). In other versions related to this one, “*Si vis mentem . . .*” and “*et si vis orare . . .*” form a single sentence beginning the description of the second psalm use; see, for instance, the version printed in PL 101:466 (which clarifies the sense somewhat by using “*de dei indulgentia*” in place of “*dei indulgentiam*”).

³³ For the text of “*Canticum psalmorum animas decorat . . .*,” see PL 131:142 and De Bruyne, *Préfaces*, 77–78; see also the version in PL 142:46. Manuscript copies in individual countries are listed in *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus*, 7 vols. in 12, *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-Hist. Klasse* 263, 267, 276, 281, 289, 292, 306, 350, 601, 645 (Vienna, 1969–97), under the entry “*De virtute psalmorum*”; some of the volumes have an additional entry, “(Alcuini) *De psalmorum usu*,” for *De laude psalmorum*. In many manuscripts the two prefaces are given individual titles, *De laude psalmorum* and *De virtute* (or *De virtutibus*) *psalmorum*, or are presented under a single title, e.g., *De laude et virtute psalmorum*, but just as the order of the two texts may vary from one manuscript to another, the titles for the two texts often seem to be interchangeable.

without the preceding sections on the Psalter as a whole. It is included in another manuscript associated with Salzburg—the psalter in Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare 149, fols. 155v–156r (siglum *L*)—and appears in an even more abridged form in two glossed psalters produced or used at St. Gall: Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek 30, fols. 10v–11v (siglum *M*), and St. Gall. Stiftsbibliothek 27, pp. 721–722 (siglum *N*).³⁴

Although it is the short version of *De laude psalmorum* that appears in these ninth-century glossed psalters, other versions were included with the glossed psalters or psalm commentaries produced in the subsequent centuries. The commentary of Bruno of Würzburg transmitted in a group of eleventh-century Tegernsee manuscripts and in other locations throughout the later Middle Ages sometimes included a long version (“Quia etiam prophetiae spiritus”) and sometimes included just an excerpt of the text.³⁵ Other psalm commentaries also served as major vehicles for the transmission of the various versions of the text: the version beginning “Prophetiae spiritus” was often used as a preface to Augustine’s *Enarrationes in psalmos* (siglum *K* is a twelfth-century example), and other versions are found among—or embedded in—the prologues of the psalm commentaries or *postillae* of Jerome, Remi-

³⁴ On Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare 149, see the description by Pierre Salmon (based on Wilmart’s notes) in *Testimonia orationis christiana antiquioris*, ed. P. Salmon, C. Coebergh, and P. de Puniet, CCCM 47 (Turnhout, 1977), 35–39; and on the date and origin, see Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen* 2:189–90. Margaret Gibson notes that it was “written in Salzburg but indebted to the St. Gall tradition [of glossed psalters] for both text and layout”, see “Carolingian Glossed Psalters,” in *The Early Medieval Bible: Its Production, Decoration and Use*, ed. Richard Gameson (Cambridge, 1994), 80 (and see 80–85 and 97 n. 63 for Göttweig 30 and St. Gall 27). On Göttweig 30, see also Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen* 2:44–45, and *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, vol. 1: Aachen–Lambach (Wiesbaden, 1998), 295, no. 1412. In these ninth-century manuscripts containing just the section on the psalm uses, the description of use 2 begins “Si vis orare . . .”, but in Turin, Biblioteca nazionale G.V.2, fols. 1r–3v (s. x–xi), the description of use 2 begins “Si vis mentem tuam spirituali gaudio et laetitia illuminare . . .”, as in some of the longer versions.

³⁵ The long version appears in at least one of the manuscripts containing the commentary listed in Christine Elisabeth Eder, “Die Schule des Klosters Tegernsee im frühen Mittelalter im Spiegel der Tegernseer Handschriften,” *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens* 83 (1972): 74 n. 132 (also pp. 103–6 and 126)—Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 18121, fols. 3r–4v; I have not been able to determine whether this or any other form of the text appears in the extract of the commentary in Clm 19416, fols. 194r–209r, or in Vatican City, BAV Rossi 184, but the presence of “Quia etiam prophetiae spiritus” in other manuscripts containing the commentary (the fourteenth-century Franciscan manuscript Naples, Biblioteca nazionale VII.AA.7, fol. 1r–v, and the fifteenth-century Cistercian manuscript Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek M. p. th. f. 91, fols. 3r–4v) indicate that *De laude psalmorum* was commonly used as a preface for the commentary. The remaining manuscripts listed by Eder contain just excerpts (Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud. lat. 96, fol. 251r, and Rawl. G. 163, fol. 252r).

gius of Auxerre, and Nicholas of Lyra, as well as Ludolph of Saxony's prologue discussed above.³⁶

Apart from florilegia and psalters or psalm commentaries, several manuals of devotion and liturgical commentaries utilized *De laude psalmorum*. It has already been noted that the text was incorporated in the last chapter of Dhuoda's *Liber manualis* for her son and more than five centuries later in the treatises of Ralph of Rivo; a short version related to the one in Göttweig 30 and St. Gall 27 psalters also appears together with excerpts from Cassiodorus and Isidore and others in a work entitled *Benedictio Dei*, which was dedicated to Baturic, bishop of Regensburg (817–47), and possibly compiled by Hrabanus Maurus.³⁷ But the most significant application of the text is in Carolingian prayerbooks. In the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald in the Munich Schatzkammer (ca. 870), a model of early medieval ruler piety, the psalms constituting uses 1–7 are listed on fols. 19v–21r as a form of private devotion;³⁸ and, as noted at the outset of this study, by the mid-ninth century a full program of private devotion had emerged, with the psalms in the individual uses accompanied by *capitula* and Psalter collects. We may turn to this program of devotion in the ninth-century prayerbooks, offering an account of the process by which it was established and determining its precise relationship to *De laude psalmorum* and other texts associated with Alcuin.

The assignment of *capitula* to each of the psalms in the eight uses outlined in *De laude psalmorum* and the presentation of the individual psalms with their respective collects is a development that must have taken place between the composition of *De laude psalmorum* and the compilation of the ninth-century prayerbooks in which the full uses appear. The seven penitential

³⁶ The short version of the text, beginning "Si vis agere confessionem" and preceded by "Canticum psalmorum animas decorat," is printed as part of the *praeambula* to Remigius of Auxerre's *Enarrationes in psalmos*, PL 131:143; the other commentaries that appear with various versions of the text are indicated in the list on pp. 36–43 below.

³⁷ The edition of *Benedictio Dei* by Petrus Stevartius Leodius (Ingolstadt, 1616) is included in the supplement (vol. 27) of *Bibliotheca vetus patrum* (Lyon, 1677), 575–89, and reprinted in PL 129:1399–1436; it has also been printed in *Thesaurus monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et historicorum* 2.2, ed. J. Basnage (Antwerp, 1725), 19–44, and the letter of dedication, based on Stevartius's edition, has been printed by E. Dümmler in *Epistolae Karolini Aevi* 3, MGH *Epistolae* 5 (Berlin, 1899), 359–60. On the authorship of the work, see Bernhard Bischoff, "Literarisches und künstlerisches Leben in St. Emmeram (Regensburg) während des frühen und hohen Mittelalters," reprinted in *Mittelalterliche Studien* 2 (Stuttgart, 1967), 77–78. The section on the psalm uses (*Augustinus de laude psalmorum dicit*) is included in the edition below (siglum BEN) along with the version of *De laude psalmorum* in Dhuoda's *Liber manualis* (siglum DHU).

³⁸ The psalms are simply listed in the manuscript with short rubrics for the individual uses, but in the edition by Felicianus, *Liber precationum Caroli Calvi* (Ingolstadt, 1583), the psalms have been written out in full on pp. 16–94.

psalms constituting the first use, however, appear with their *capitula* and collects—but without any of the other uses—in Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale 1742, a manuscript probably written within a year of Alcuin's death;³⁹ in this manuscript, which contains Alcuin's *De virtutibus et vitiis*, the penitential psalms with *capitula* and collects form part of a collection of private devotion (the *Libellus Trecensis*) along with a confession apparently written by Alcuin for Charlemagne, “Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae.”⁴⁰ Another early manuscript containing Alcuin's confession and other works—Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek 106, written ca. 809 and modelled on a manual that Alcuin sent to Arno of Salzburg in 802—includes what seems to be a similar program of devotion but provides only the collects for the seven penitential psalms (with no incipits for the psalms themselves or *capitula* before the individual Psalter collects).⁴¹

³⁹ On the possibility that the manuscript was written while Alcuin was abbot of St. Martin's at Tours, see Wilhelm Köhler, “Turonische Handschriften aus der Zeit Alkuins,” in *Mittelalterliche Handschriften: Paläographische, kunsthistorische, literarische und bibliotheksgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag von Hermann Degering*, ed. Alois Bömer and Joachim Kirchner (Leipzig, 1926; rpt. Hildesheim, 1973), 172–80. The manuscript was written at Tours ca. 805 according to Bullough, “Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven,” 12 (rpt. 169); see also Edward Kennard Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours*, 2 vols., Studies in the Script of Tours 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), 1:113–14; but cf. the reference to this manuscript in Rosamond McKitterick, “Manuscripts and Scriptoria in the Reign of Charles the Bald, 840–877,” in *Giovanni Scoto nel suo tempo: L'organizzazione del sapere in età carolingia* (Spoleto, 1989), 207–8 n. 13 (s. IX in., Sens).

⁴⁰ The confession is on fols. 69v–73r and the penitential psalms with *capitula* and collects are on 75v–80r (ed. A. Wilmart, *Precum libelli quattuor aevi Karolini* [Rome, 1940], 21–24 and 27–30 respectively). In the margin of fol. 78v, an eleventh-century hand has added the section of *De laude psalmorum* outlining the first two uses, but the prayerbook originally comprised nothing pertaining to uses 2–8.

⁴¹ The collects for the seven penitential psalms are on fol. 22r–v, after Alcuin's *Expositio in psalmos poenitentiales* (PL 100:569–96); “Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae” appears later in the manuscript, on fols. 62r–63r. The collects are reproduced in Leslie Webber Jones, *The Script of Cologne from Hildebald to Hermann* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), plates XXXVI–XXXVII, and listed by Wilmart in *Precum libelli quattuor aevi Karolini*, 53; for the confession, see *ibid.*, 56, and the apparatus on pp. 21–24. Neither the collects nor the confession are known to have been included in the original manual sent to Arno, but both formed part of the Cologne manuscript before its completion ca. 809. On the composition of the manuscript, see Leslie Webber Jones, “Cologne MS. 106: A Book of Hildebald,” *Speculum* 4 (1929): 27–61; and *Script of Cologne*, 40–43. On the date and origin (possibly Werden), see Richard Drögereit, *Werden und der Heliand* (Essen, 1951), 31–35; Maurice Coens, *Recueil des Études Bollandiennes*, Subsidia Hagiographica 37 (Brussels, 1963), 139, 148–49; Bernhard Bischoff, “Panorama der Handschriftenüberlieferung aus der Zeit Karls des Großen,” in *Das geistige Leben*, ed. B. Bischoff, vol. 2 of *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, ed. Wolfgang Braunfels (Düsseldorf, 1965), 234–35 n. 8; Bullough, “Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven,” 68 and n. 159 (rpt. 206 and n. 163); and *Handschriftenkatalog Rheinland: Erfassung mittelalterlicher*

There is no reason to suppose that the program of penitential psalms with *capitula* and collects in Troyes 1742 or the set of collects for these psalms in Cologne 106 is based on *De laude psalmorum*, which prescribes the same psalms for use 1, i.e., when penance is desired. Since *De laude psalmorum* prescribes for this use an existing group of psalms (6, 31, 37, 50, 101, 129, and 142, designated as the penitential psalms since at least the sixth century),⁴² the compiler of the program in the Troyes 1742 could have selected these psalms independently, assigning *capitula* (psalm verses) to each, and including the Psalter collects for the respective psalms taken from the Roman series of collects for all 150 psalms.⁴³ Despite any common association with Alcuin, the list of psalm uses in *De laude psalmorum* and the program of devotion in Troyes 1742 may be considered independent compilations.

In addition to the early ninth-century prayerbooks containing “Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae” and the program based on the penitential psalms, there is some external evidence associating this material with Alcuin and attesting to its original usage outside the context of the eight psalm uses. A letter possibly written in 822 by Hrabanus Maurus to Judith, the second wife of Louis the Pious, outlines a morning program of private devotion consisting of the confession that Alcuin wrote for Charlemagne followed by the seven penitential psalms with a litany and with *capitula* and orations (collects).⁴⁴ The confession to which this refers is certainly “Deus inaestimabilis misericor-

Handschriften im rheinischen Landesteil von Nordrhein-Westfalen, 3 vols., ed. Günter Gattermann and Heinz Finger (Wiesbaden, 1993), 634–35.

⁴² See Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmorum* 6.1, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 97 (Turnhout, 1958), 71.

⁴³ The three sets of collects identified as the *africana series*, *hispana series*, and *romana series* (on the basis of the versions of the Psalter supposedly used in their composition) are edited in André Wilmart and Louis Brou, *The Psalter Collects from V–VIth Century Sources*, Henry Bradshaw Society 83 (London, 1949). The three series—at least by the time of the earliest manuscripts in which they appear—had no place in the liturgy, although the Spanish series is a Carolingian collection drawn from the multiple series of orations used in the Old Spanish Cathedral Office, i.e., the *Liber orationum psalmographus*, ed. Jorge Pinell, *Monumenta Hispaniae Sacra, serie liturgica* 9 (Barcelona, 1972). The Roman series as a whole first appears in ninth-century psalters, and this led R. W. Pfaff to question the traditional view that the series was composed several centuries earlier (see “Psalter Collects as an Aid to the Classification of Psalters,” in *Studia Patristica* 18.2, Papers of the 1983 Oxford Patristics Conference: Critica, Classica, Ascetica, Liturgica, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone [Kalamazoo and Leuven, 1989], 397–402). The presence of seven of the Roman series collects in Troyes 1742 and Cologne 106, however, suggests that the full series from which these seven were drawn had been in existence before the ninth century.

⁴⁴ A. Wilmart, “Lettres de l’époque carolingienne, *Revue bénédictine* 34 (1922): 241: “...mane cum surrexeritis ... confessionem quam beatae memoriae Alcuinus (domino Karolo) dedit, in exemplo illius secrete ... faciatis. Et postea septem paenitentiae psalmos intente et devote cum letania et suis capitulis atque orationibus domino decantetis.”

diae," since two of the extant manuscripts containing this prayer present it in similar terms as a confession that Alcuin wrote for Charlemagne.⁴⁵ Furthermore, in a number of manuscripts "Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae" is introduced by a letter Alcuin addressed to Charlemagne, proposing a daily set of hours that could serve as a lay counterpart to the observance of the Divine Office; the letter, as it has come down to us, includes just the beginning of such a set of hours—a series of psalm verses and other formulas to be recited upon rising from bed (presumably at the beginning of the day)—and in some manuscripts this leads directly into "Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae," suggesting that the confession was intended to be part of the *ordo* Alcuin set out for Charlemagne.⁴⁶ Even in some of the manuscripts containing the con-

⁴⁵ In Angers, Bibliothèque municipale 18 (s. ix), a psalter, the prayer begins on fol. 183v with the rubric "Confessio quam beatus Alcuinus composuit domino Karolo imperatori," and in the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald in the Schatzkammer of Munich, the prayer begins on fol. 14r with the rubric "Confessio quam Alcuinus composuit Karolo imperatori."

⁴⁶ The letter is printed as Alcuin's Ep. 304 in *Epistolae Karolini Aevi* 2:462–63. Dümmler used two ninth-century manuscripts in his edition: Paris, BnF lat. 2731A, fols. 40r–41v, and the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald, fols. 4v–5v. The Paris manuscript and the 1583 edition of the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald (ed. Felicianus) had earlier been used by Froben, who printed the letter as the preface to his 1777 edition of *Officia per ferias* (Alcuin, *Opera* 2:52; PL 101:509–10). In *Precum libelli quattuor aevi Karolini*, 33–34, Wilmart printed the version of the letter found in Paris, BnF lat. 5596, fol. 119v (s. ix¹), and in an apparatus he presented the variant readings from Paris, BnF lat. 2731A, the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald, Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek 106, fol. 1v (an addition written in a hand nearly contemporary with the original hands, i.e., s. ix in.; see Jones, "Cologne MS. 106," 39, and *Script of Cologne*, 40), and two eleventh century psalters, Paris, BnF lat. 11550, fol. 1r (from Saint-Germain), and Oxford, Bodleian Library D'Orville 45, fol. 26r–v (from Moissac). Wilmart also noted the presence of the letter in Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare 149, fol. 155v, but he did not list the variants from this ninth-century psalter (the version in this manuscript is in fact most closely related to the Cologne 106 version but more extensive). The letter also appears on fol. 144r–v of Paris, BnF lat. 5338, in the ninth-century section of the manuscript, which was the original beginning of the collection in Paris, BnF lat. 1153 known as *Officia per ferias*. (Froben's decision to insert Alcuin's letter as the preface to his edition of *Officia per ferias* is remarkable, since neither he nor Duchesne knew of this section in Paris, BnF lat. 5338, which contained the letter; see n. 63 below.) Later copies of the letter are found in Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek 45, fol. 1r (s. x), Vatican City, BAV Vat. lat. 4226, fol. 1r (s. xi–xii), and Barb. lat. 472, fol. 44r (s. xiii; ed. G. P. Götz, *Liber Quare*, CCCM 60 [Turnhout, 1983], 234). For a translation of the letter and a discussion of its significance in the development of the Divine Office and private devotion, see Black, "Daily Cursus," 273–83.

In Paris, BnF lat. 2731A and in Oxford, D'Orville 45 the letter is followed immediately by the confession and the psalm uses (see pp. 26 and 29 below). In the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald the letter (without the *ordo*) ends on fol. 5v and the *ordo* appears in a modified form on fol. 7r–v, followed by five prayers, the last of which is "Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae" (fol. 14r–19r), and a summary of the psalm uses. The version of the letter in Paris, BnF lat. 5338 would have originally appeared some seventeen folios before the confession on fols. 13v–15r of Paris, BnF lat. 1153, but most of the intervening material would not have appeared at

fession without the letter, remnants of the *ordo* in the letter precede the confession.⁴⁷

This evidence suggests that Alcuin wrote the confession for Charlemagne as part of an *ordo* of private, noncanonical hours. There is no evidence that Alcuin intended the seven penitential psalms with *capitula* and collects to be used in this same context, immediately after the confession, and it is not even clear that Alcuin is responsible for assembling the program based on the penitential psalms, but the presence of this program in Troyes 1742 indicates that it dates back to Alcuin's time; it may therefore have been formed as early as *De laude psalmorum*, or even earlier, but seems to have originally existed outside the context of the psalm uses outlined in *De laude psalmorum*.

“Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae” continued to appear independently or in conjunction with the program based on the penitential psalms in ninth- to eleventh-century prayer collections,⁴⁸ and in subsequent centuries the confes-

this point in the model on which *Officia per ferias* was based. Of the other manuscripts containing Alcuin's letter, the only one which also contains the confession is Cologne 106, and there the letter and confession appear separately: the letter is at the beginning of the volume (preceded on fol. 1r–v by an expanded version of the *ordo*), and the confession is on fols. 62r–63r (on the hands responsible for these sections, see Jones, “Cologne MS. 106,” 36–39).

⁴⁷ In Arras, Bibliothèque municipale 636 (709) (s. IX ex.), the confession on fol. 78r–v is preceded by the verses “Domine ihesu christe, fili dei vivi, in nomine tuo levabo manus meas” (cf. Ps 62:5) and “Deus in adiutorium meum . . .” (Ps 69:2), which form part of the *ordo*. These verses appear in reverse order, under the rubric *De oratione cottidiana*, before the confession in Orléans, Bibliothèque municipale 184 (s. IX), p. 329–30 (PL 101:1404–5), and the same rubric and verses appear on p. 705 of St. Gall 27, among the texts preceding the confession (on pp. 707–10). In the Psalter of Louis the German, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz theol. lat. fol. 58 (Saint-Bertin, s. IX med.), the confession on fols. 115r–116v is preceded by the rubric *De lecto surgendo dicendum est* and the two verses cited above, corresponding precisely to the short version of the *ordo* found at the end of the letter in the eleventh-century manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library D'Orville 45 (see the preceding note); since these two manuscripts and the early ninth-century manuscript, Troyes 1742, constitute a tight group in the textual tradition of the confession, it is quite possible that in their common source, written before Alcuin's death, the confession was preceded by the *ordo* (which the Berlin and Oxford manuscripts retained) or by the whole letter (which only the Oxford manuscript retained). In Paris, BnF lat. 13388 (Tours, s. IX med.), the confession on fols. 16v–19v is preceded on fols. 10r–16v by an *ordo orationum* beginning “Statim ut de lecto surrexeris” and containing the verses from the *ordo* in Alcuin's letter, together with other verses and prayers (see the edition in Wilmart, *Precum libelli quattuor aevi Karolini*, 68–75). Finally, in Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Car. C. 161 (s. IX), the confession on fols. 192v–195r is preceded by the rubric *Oratio vel confessio postquam surgendum*, another apparent remnant of the *ordo* in Alcuin's letter.

⁴⁸ The confession appears independently in several ninth-century manuscripts that have already been mentioned: Angers 18, Orléans 184, Zurich Car. C. 161 (see nn. 45 and 47 above), and four manuscripts containing long or short versions of *De laude psalmorum*—Göttweig 30, fols. 5r–6r, St. Gall 27, pp. 707–10; Rome, Biblioteca nazionale centrale Sessoriana 71, fols. 68r–69v, and Sessoriana 95, fols. 146r–149r (the confession simply appears as one of a series

sion appears either in its entirety or in an abbreviated version, sometimes in the context of Anselmian devotions.⁴⁹ It has also come down to us in Anglo-Saxon translation.⁵⁰ Another indication of the wide circulation of the prayer is the fact that numerous passages in it have parallels in other prayers which first appear in ninth-century collections.⁵¹ The most extensive set of parallels is in a liturgical context, in a *Confiteor*-formula from a Turonian sacramentary.⁵² The program of penitential psalms with *capitula* and collects also found a liturgical application in addition to its application in private devotion: it appears in certain sacramentaries and pontificals as part of a penitential *ordo*.⁵³

of prayers in each of these manuscripts, not in association with the psalm uses). In Arras 636 (709), fol. 78r–v, and in Vatican City, BAV Vat. lat. 82, fol. 256r–v, a lacuna at the end of the confession makes it difficult to determine whether or not it was followed by the program of penitential psalms. The confession also appears independently in the following late tenth- and eleventh-century manuscripts: Angers, Bibliothèque municipale 19, fols. 89v–92r; Arras, Bibliothèque municipale 735 (763), fols. 75v–77v; London, British Library Arundel 155, fols. 175v–177v; British Library Cotton Vespasian A.i (added section), fols. 156v–157v; Vatican City, BAV Barb. lat. 474, fols. 44r–45v; BAV Chigi C VI 173, fols. 49v–50v, 52r; and BAV Reg. lat. 12, fols. 177r–179r.

⁴⁹ The abbreviated version is the apocryphal *Oratio* 8 printed in G. Gerberon's 1675 edition of Anselm's *Orationes* (PL 158:896); see André Wilmart, "La tradition des prières de saint Anselm: Tables et notes," *Revue bénédictine* 36 (1924): 64.

⁵⁰ In London, British Library Arundel 155 (see n. 48 above), the Latin text is found with a complete interlinear gloss; both are printed in H. Logeman, "Anglo-Saxonica Minora (I)," *Anglia* 11 (1889): 115–20. A separate translation of the first quarter of "Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae" serves as the beginning of an Anglo-Saxon prayer found in London, British Library Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 44r–45v, and Royal 2.B.v, fol. 197r–198r; see the editions of the respective versions in Phillip Pulsiano and Joseph McGowan, "Four Unedited Prayers in London, British Library Cotton Tiberius A.iii," *Mediaeval Studies* 56 (1994): 206, with commentary on 189 and 199; and Logeman, "Anglo-Saxonica Minora (I)," 112–15.

⁵¹ Even the incipit has a parallel in an otherwise unrelated prayer found in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 512 (s. ix), fols. 96v–97r, and in Arras 735 (763), fols. 16r–17r: "Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae, deus auctor humanae salutis (sal. hum. *al. MS.*)" (Arras 735 [763] includes Alcuin's confession as well [see n. 48 above], and Mazarine 512 may have originally included both prayers, as it has a lacuna at the beginning of use 1, where Alcuin's confession would have most likely appeared.)

⁵² Paris, BnF lat. 9430, fols. 263r–266r, printed in *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* 1.6.7 *ordo* 3, ed. E. Martène, 2d ed., 4 vols. (Antwerp, 1736–38), 1:775–79. This section of the manuscript (fols. 263–270) is apparently a tenth-century addition to one of the major sacramentaries dispersed throughout this manuscript and Tours, Bibliothèque municipale 184 (see Rand, *Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours* 1:192, no. 186 [and vol. 2, plate 183, no. 1]; V. Leroquais, *Les sacramentaires et les missels manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 3 vols. [Paris, 1924], 1:52; and Jean Deshusses, *Le sacramentaire grégorien: Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits*, 3 vols. [Fribourg, 1971–82], 2:56–57).

⁵³ Paris, BnF nouv. acq. 1589, fols. 107v–109r (ed. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* 1:783–84; and Deshusses, *Le sacramentaire grégorien* 3:117–18 [nos. 3970–76] and 124–26); Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 227, fols. 35v–37v (ed. Aldo Martini, *Il cosiddetto Pontificale*

Furthermore, the combination of the confession and the program of penitential psalms without the other uses—as first seen at the beginning of the ninth century in Troyes 1742—continued to appear as a distinct prayerbook tradition in the eleventh century,⁵⁴ and even in some of the prayerbooks that do contain the other psalm uses, the confession and program of penitential psalms, which constitute use 1, are separated from the other psalm uses.⁵⁵

di Poitiers, Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, series maior, fontes 14 [Rome, 1979], 42–44); Göttingen, Universitätsbibliothek theol. 231, fols. 37r–38r (ed. H. J. Schmitz, *Die Bußbücher und das kanonische Bußverfahren nach handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt* [Düsseldorf, 1989; rpt. Graz, 1958], 60–61; and *Sacramentarium Fuldense saeculi X*, ed. Gregor Richter and Albert Schönsfelder [Fulda, 1912; rpt. as Henry Bradshaw Society 101], 43–45); Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 6425 (ed. Michel Andrieu, *Les "Ordines Romani" du haut moyen-âge*, vol. 5 [Louvain, 1961], Appendix I, 370–72). Cf. *Ordo Romanus L* 18.19–20 (ibid., 116–19 [=Pontificale Romano-Germanicum 99.56]); and Paris, BnF lat. 2293 (ed. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* 1:871).

Another liturgical association of the program is evident in London, British Library Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fols. 46v–50v, ed. Beate Günzel, *Ælfwine's Prayerbook (London, British Library, Cotton Titus D.xxvi + xxvii)*, Henry Bradshaw Society 108 (London, 1993), 175–78; in this tenth-century English prayerbook, the program—with an extra psalm (Ps 85), *capitula*, and collect inserted before the fourth penitential psalm—appears immediately after a series of collects for the Office, presumably taken from a sacramentary.

⁵⁴ In London, British Library Cotton Galba A.xiv, ed. Bernard James Muir, *A Pre-Conquest English Prayer-Book (BL MSS Cotton Galba A.xiv and Nero A.ii [ff. 3–13])*, Henry Bradshaw Society 103 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1988), 70–79, the confession on fols. 53r–57r is followed on fols. 59r–62r by the program of penitential psalms. In Manchester, John Rylands Library lat. 116 (s. ix), a psalter from Trier, the confession appears on fols. 109v–110v and the incomplete program of penitential psalms appears on fol. 113r–v; in this case, however, we cannot rule out the possibility that the other psalm uses originally followed. This is also the case with the use 1 fragment—with the description of use 1 from *De laude psalmorum* added in the margin—in Paris, BnF lat. 2843, fol. 160r–v (s. x), from Saint-Martial of Limoges.

⁵⁵ In Paris, BnF lat. 13388, use 1, beginning with the confession, appears on fols. 16v–26v and the other psalm uses appear on fols. 70r–77r, after a long series of orations and hymns. This separation of use 1 from the other uses is also evident in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 512. In this case, however, the arrangement of the psalm uses is somewhat complicated. Some of the original gatherings in this manuscript are missing, and the complete or partial gatherings that remain have been bound entirely out of order. The folios were numbered after the gatherings were bound in their current order, but original signatures are visible on some of the gatherings, and with the help of these signatures Jean-Baptiste Molin has reconstructed the original order (“Les manuscrits,” 136; see also Black, “Daily Cursus,” 281–82 n. 43). Use 1, perhaps opening with the confession, must have begun on one of the missing gatherings, the third gathering of the original manuscript, since the psalm incipits, *capitula*, and collects constituting the end of use 1 appear on the current fols. 9r–15v, in what would have originally been the fourth gathering of eight folios. On fol. 84v—in the original fifteenth gathering—the passage from *De laude psalmorum* describing the first of the eight psalm uses appears, but the body of use 1 (*capitula*, collects, etc.) is not repeated; this is followed on fols. 85r–95v and 42r–48r—in the original fifteenth to seventeenth gatherings—by the other seven uses, presented in full with psalms, *capitula*, collects, and intervening prayers.

From all this evidence we may conclude that the confession and the program of penitential psalms originally existed outside the context of the psalm uses outlined in *De laude psalmorum*. During the course of the ninth century, this program, which dates back to Alcuin's time and may have been formulated by him, was integrated with the outline of eight psalm uses in *De laude psalmorum*. A ninth- or tenth-century manuscript, Paris, BnF lat. 1154, preserves traces of what may have been the first stage in this process. After a series of prayers and confessions (including the confession "Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae," on fols. 41v–45r), the program of penitential psalms with *capitula* and collects appears on fols. 54v–57r, and this is followed on fols. 58r–60v by the passages from *De laude psalmorum* outlining the other seven psalm uses.⁵⁶ Such a combination of texts would have naturally led to the next stage, in which *capitula* and collects were assigned to the psalms prescribed for uses 2–8 in *De laude psalmorum*, resulting in a complete implementation of the program that Alcuin merely outlined.

The manuscripts that contain the full set of eight uses, dating from the mid-ninth century or later, present them with other devotional material in diverse arrangements, but they must be derived from a common source, a nonextant archetype compiled in the first half of the ninth century, and this original compilation may be reconstructed from the derived programs in the extant manuscripts. There are six manuscripts from the middle or second half of the ninth century:

El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo L.III.8 (Senlis). The program of psalm uses is defective; after a lacuna, fols. 118r–127r contain the end of the confession "Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae," followed by the rest of use 1, then use 2, and the first half of use 3, but the program ends abruptly in the middle of fol. 127r and is followed on the next line by unrelated hagiographical material.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ The passages are taken from *De laude psalmorum* out of sequence: the manuscript presents uses 2, 4, 6, 3, 5, 7, and 8, with *tituli* supplied for all, although the one for use 2 has been cut out. The list of incipits in Sam Barrett, "Music and Writing: On the Compilation of Paris Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 1154," *Early Music History* 16 (1997): 81, seems to suggest that the clause "Si vis mentem tuam spirituali . . ." has been omitted at the beginning of this series, but there is no basis for this suggestion since the text in BnF lat. 1154 does not belong to the tradition that places this clause at the beginning of use 2 (see n. 32 above). The text for the individual uses in this manuscript has been included in the edition below (siglum *Pa 1*).

⁵⁷ This is one of the prayerbooks included in the appendix of the École nationale des chartes thesis by Jean Chazelas, "Les livrets de prières privées du IX^e siècle: Essai sur la théologie morale et la psychologie des fidèles" (see *Positions des thèses* [1959]: 19–20). On the origin and history of the manuscript (written before 870), see Raymund Kottje, "Zur Herkunft der Handschrift Escorial, Bibl. de S. Lorenzo L III 8, aus Senlis," *Francia* 13 (1985): 623–24; and Bischoff, *Katalog*, 252, no. 1195. The manuscript begins with liturgical *expositiones* in-

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine lat. 512 (Saint-Eloi in Noyen). The defective use 1 appears on fols. 9r–15v (original fourth gathering), and uses 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, 7, and 8 appear on fols. 85r–95v and 42r–48r (original fifteenth to seventeenth gatherings).⁵⁸

Paris, BnF lat. 1248, fols. 89r–116v (N. France; used at Saint-Martial of Limoges). This section of the manuscripts is defective, beginning in the middle of “Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae,” and continuing with the rest of use 1 (with a lacuna after fol. 93r), followed by use 2, and (after a series of prayers on fols. 99v–107r) uses 3, 4, 6, 5, 7, and 8.⁵⁹

Paris, BnF lat. 2731A (Reims).⁶⁰ The confession “Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae” begins on fol. 41v, immediately after Alcuin’s letter to Charlemagne (fols. 40r–41v), and is followed on fols. 44r–57r by the rest of use 1 and uses 2, 6, 4, 5, 7, and 3 (use 8 being omitted in this arrangement).⁶¹

cluding, on fols. 14r–25r, a commentary on the Canon of the Mass, “*Dominus vobiscum. Salutat populum . . .*,” which also appears in two other manuscripts of interest here: Arras 636 (709), fols. 69r–74v (see n. 47 above on the presence of “Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae” in this manuscript) and Paris, BnF lat. 1248, fols. 5r–23v (see below); the Escorial text is printed in PL 83:1145–54, and the Escorial and Paris texts are among those listed by J. M. Hanssens (*Amalarii episcopi Opera liturgica omnia*, vol. 1, *Studi e testi* 138 [Vatican, 1948], 110–14; text on 284–338). After a commentary on baptism on fols. 25r–28v (see Susan A. Keefe, “Carolingian Baptismal Expositions: A Handlist of Tracts and Manuscripts,” in *Carolingian Essays*, 180–81), there is a lacuna in the manuscript and, on fols. 30r–41v, a defective copy of Alcuin’s *De virtutibus et vitiis*. The *Liber de remedis peccatorum* (*Paenitentiale additivum Ps.-Beda-Egberti*; see Reinhold Hagenmüller, *Die Überlieferung der Beda und Egbert zugeschriebenen Büßbücher* [Frankfurt, 1991], 60–61) on fols. 80r–95v and a canonistic collection on fols. 95v–117v precedes the psalm uses and the Martyrology of Bede.

⁵⁸ See n. 55 above on the foliation and gatherings of this manuscript, written at the end of the ninth century in a Saint-Amand script according to Bernhard Bischoff, “Das Reisegebet des Gildas (Spätes siebentes Jahrhundert?),” in *Anecdota novissima: Texte des vierten bis sechzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 7 (Stuttgart, 1984), 154. On the psalm uses and related material, see Molin, “Les manuscrits,” 137–40; and Black, “Daily Cursus,” 334–42, 352–58. Other sections of this extensive prayerbook are the subject of an article by Stephan Waldhoff, “Memoria im privaten Beten des frühen Mittelalters anhand der Gebetstexte der Handschrift Paris, Bibl. Mazarine, ms. 512,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 38/39 (1996–97): 173–250 (including an edition of fols. 106r–107v and 75v–84v). This prayerbook is also included in the appendix of Chazelas, “Les livrets de prières.”

⁵⁹ The prayerbook (fols. 89r–116r) is one of the sections of the manuscript listed as s. ix med. in Keefe, “Carolingian Baptismal Expositions,” 222. The rest of the manuscript (s. ix and s. xi) contains various liturgical commentaries and *ordines*. For a description, see Andrieu, *Les “Ordines Romani,”* vol. 1 (Louvain, 1931), 265–69; and see n. 57 above. On the psalm uses, see Molin, “Les manuscrits,” 124–26; and Black, “Daily Cursus,” 335–41.

⁶⁰ On the localization and the possibility that this manuscript is the work of the scribe Framegaudus (s. ix ex.), see Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen* 2:176–77.

⁶¹ There are no lacunas in the manuscript, which consists of eight signed gatherings of eight folios. Use 3, the last of the seven psalm uses in the manuscript, is followed by a Psalter

Paris, BnF lat. 5338, fols. 143r–146v + BnF lat. 1153 (Saint-Denis). The fragment now found at the end of BnF lat. 5338 consists of two bifolia—the second, fourth, fifth, and seventh folios—of a gathering of eight, which originally preceded the first gathering in BnF lat. 1153; the fragment contains parts of *De laude psalmorum*, Alcuin's letter to Charlemagne, a morning prayer, and the beginning of use 3;⁶² and the section of the prayerbook on fols. 1r–78r of BnF lat. 1153 contains the end of use 3 followed by the other seven uses together with extra psalm uses and other material, all distributed among the seven days of the week or ferias: use 3 on Sunday (labelled feria i on fol. 145r

preface (Ep. 51 of Ps. Jerome) on fols. 57v–60r, and by a series of prayers on fols. 60r–64v. See the description in *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1952), 40–41. The manuscript begins with Ambrosius Autpertus, *Libellus de conflictu vitiorum atque virtutum* (fols. 1r–24r, used in the edition by R. Weber, CCCC 27B [Turnhout, 1979], 907–31) and *De regula* (fols. 24r–40r). On the psalm uses, see Molin, "Les manuscrits," 126–28; and Black, "Daily Cursus," 335–42.

⁶² On Alcuin's letter, see n. 46 above. The prayer "Mane cum surrexero" at the end of the letter appears in various versions, with different incipits, in early medieval prayerbooks (see, e.g., PL 101:490–91 and 1385–86; Wilmart, *Precum libelli quattuor aevi Karolini*, 10–11 and 38). It appears in two of the manuscripts containing Alcuin's letter—Paris, BnF lat. 5596 and the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald—but does not immediately follow the letter in those cases.

Fols. 143r–146v of Paris, BnF lat. 5338 were identified by Chazelas, "Les livrets de prières," as *membra disiecta* belonging with BnF lat. 1153 (see *Positions des thèses* [1959]: 20). The folios of the fragment (220–25 × 170 mm.) were trimmed after they were detached from the BnF lat. 1153 section (225 × 175 mm.) but apparently before they were bound in with the larger folios of BnF lat. 5338, which contains works in various later hands. The writing frame in the fragment is identical to that of the first gathering of BnF lat. 1153 (165 × 125 mm., 24 lines). The missing bifolium that contained the third and sixth folios of the original gathering accounts for the lacuna in *De laude psalmorum* between fols. 143v and 144r and the lacuna in use 3 between fols. 145v and 146r, and the missing eighth folio accounts for the lacuna in use 3 between fol. 146v (ending in Ps 103, after verse 17) and fol. 1r of BnF lat. 1153 (beginning in Ps 104 at verse 14), which is the first folio of a complete gathering of eight, bearing the signature "ii" on fol. 8v. The conjugate of the missing eighth folio—the first folio of the original gathering—is also missing, but there is no evidence of a lacuna in the text: fol. 143r contains the beginning of *De laude psalmorum* with a five-line initial *Q*, preceded by a *titulus* in the original hand (*Laus psalmorum sancti agustini*). Furthermore, at the top of fol. 143r a thirteenth-century hand has repeated this same *titulus* (just above the original one), apparently as a title of a manuscript, and at the bottom of the folio the ex libris "Iste liber est beati dionysii" is written along with the thirteenth-century shelfmark ("Q +"); there is also a fifteenth-century Saint-Denis shelfmark just beneath the ex libris (see Donatella Nebbiai-Dalla Guarda, *La bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Denis en France du IX^e au XVIII^e siècle* [Paris, 1985], 215 and pl. 1). Since Saint-Denis ownership marks normally appear on the first folio of a manuscript but may appear on the second folio (see *ibid.*, 77), the first folio of the original gathering of eight was either already missing by the thirteenth century or was decorated in such a way that the ownership marks had to be placed on the following folio. In any case, the gathering must have been still attached to the rest of the prayerbook (BnF lat. 1153) when the thirteenth- and fifteenth-century ownership marks were added, since separate Saint-Denis shelfmarks were not placed at the beginning of BnF lat. 1153.

of BnF lat. 5338); uses 1 and 6 in feria ii; use 2 and (after a lacuna preceding fol. 33r) part of use 8 in feria iii; use 4 in the first part of feria iv; use 7 in the first part of feria v; and use 5 in the first part of feria vii.⁶³ In contrast to the other extant manuscripts, which give just the incipit of the each psalm in the uses, this prayerbook has the psalms written out in full.

Paris, BnF lat. 13388 (Tours). Use 1 is on 16v–26v, an abridged version of use 7 is on fols. 33v–34r, and uses 2, 3, 4, 6, and 5 are on fols. 66r–77r (use 8 is omitted).⁶⁴

The psalm uses also appear in two later psalters:

Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek 45 (Cologne, s. x). Uses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 are on fols. 1r–7v, preceded by Alcuin's letter to Charlemagne (fol. 1r); uses 5, 7, and 8 have been omitted, and use 1 lacks the opening confession.⁶⁵

⁶³ On the psalm uses and ferial arrangement of Paris, BnF lat. 1153, fols. 1r–78r, see Molin, "Les manuscrits," 130–35; and Black, "Daily Cursus," 335–51. The second part of the prayerbook begins with long a litany, also divided into ferias, on fols. 78r–83v, and a series of prayers on fols. 84r–98v, with lacunas after fols. 95v and 98v. BnF lat. 1153 concludes with Isidore's *Synonyma* (fols. 99r–123v). The section on fols. 1r–98v of BnF lat. 1153 was edited under the title *Officia per ferias* by Duchesne and by Froben, who used Duchesne's edition, noting variants from the corresponding sections of Paris, BnF lat. 2731A, inserting as a preface the version of Alcuin's letter to Charlemagne in BnF lat. 2731A, and adding a verse oration from the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald at the end (see nn. 1 and 46 above); but since neither editor used the section of the prayerbook that is found in BnF lat. 5338, the editions lack not only the text of *De laude psalmorum* but also the beginning of use 3, the first of the psalm uses in this ferial distribution. The editions also fail to distinguish between original text and marginal additions (or interlinear corrections) by a later hand in the psalm uses and particularly in the extra uses (see below).

⁶⁴ The entire manuscript, a prayerbook with hymns and monastic Office canticles, has been edited by Wilmart, *Precum libelli quattuor aevi Karolini*, 63–166, with the psalm uses on 73–84 (use 1 in §§ 3.4–5.3 of the edition), 91 (use 7 at the beginning of § 6.1), and the others on 123–38 (§§ 11–15). Fol. 31r–v (p. 89; §5.1) contains additional material associated in other manuscripts with use 1, and fols. 103v–106r (pp. 163–65; §19.4) contains the prayer opening use 3 in the other sources. On the psalm uses, see Molin, "Les manuscrits," 128–30; and Black, "Daily Cursus," 333–41.

⁶⁵ See the entry for this manuscript in Diane Warne Anderson and Jonathan Black, *The Medieval Manuscripts of the Cologne Cathedral Library*, vol. 1: MSS. 1–100, ed. Diane Warne Anderson (Collegeville, Minn., 1995; rev. Cologne, 1997), web-version prepared by the Codices Electronici Ecclesiae Coloniensis project, <http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de> (and see the information in the CEEC databank, where Anderson's description is integrated with the descriptions in *Handschriftencensus Rheinland*, 597–98, and the exhibition catalogue, *Glaube und Wissen im Mittelalter*, ed. Joachim M. Plotzek [Munich, 1998], 219–20). Fols. 1r–7v, written in a separate hand, constitute a gathering of eight missing the first folio, but there is no evidence of a textual lacuna, since the letter begins on the present fol. 1r, and it is unlikely that the confession would have been placed before it. Similarly, there is no lacuna after use 6, which ends at the top of fol. 7va; a single prayer follows and the rest of fol. 7v is blank.

Oxford, Bodleian Library D'Orville 45 (Moissac, s. xi). Uses 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 5, with abridged versions of uses 7 and 8, are on fols. 26v–34r, preceded by Alcuin's letter to Charlemagne on fol. 26r–v and followed by *De laude psalmorum* on fols. 34r–35v.⁶⁶

It should be noted that none of these manuscripts has the eight psalm uses ordered according to the sequence in which they appear in *De laude psalmorum* (even though two of the manuscripts—Paris, BnF lat. 5338 and Oxford, Bodleian Library D'Orville 45—include *De laude psalmorum* in addition to the set of psalm uses). In presenting the psalm uses with *capitula* and collects, the manuscripts consistently place use 6 (psalms to be recited in times of trib-

⁶⁶ The material on fols. 26r–35v forms part of a series of Psalter prologues on fols. 18r–36v, which is followed by a series of prayers (fols. 36v–50r), a psalter (with Psalter collects of the *series hispana*), hymnary, and collectar; the prologues are preceded by a calendar (fols. 3v–12r) and computus tables (fols. 14r–17v). For the date of the manuscript (1067–68, on the basis of the computus tables), see Andrew G. Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 435–1600 in Oxford Libraries*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1984), 1:70 no. 436; and see the description in Boynton, “Eleventh-Century Continental Hymnaries, 228–33. For associations with Moissac, where the manuscript remained until 1678, see Jean Dufour, *La bibliothèque et le scriptorium de Moissac*, Hautes études médiévales et modernes 15 (Geneva, 1972), 29 and nn. 68, 71; and idem, “Les manuscrits liturgiques de Moissac,” in *Liturgie et musique (IX^e–XIV^e s.)*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 17 (Toulouse, 1982), 124–25.

There are indications that Moissac possessed at least one other manuscript containing the letter to Charlemagne and perhaps the psalm uses. An inventory of the library at Moissac compiled in January 1678 contains the following entry: “Quelques œuvres d’Alcuin . . . en 2 vol. in-quarto: *In nomine Dei summi. Incipit scriptum Albini magistri ad Carolum imperatorem*; ce sont des pseaumes et des oraisons et une epistre *Albini ad Elipantum . . .*” (Jean Dufour, “La composition de la bibliothèque de Moissac à la lumière d’un inventaire du XVII^e siècle nouvellement découvert,” *Scriptorium* 35 [1981]: 194). Dufour has identified the final part of this entry with Paris, BnF lat. 2388, which begins with Alcuin’s letter to Elipandus, but he knew of no work corresponding to the preceding part of the entry in a Moissac manuscript (*ibid.*, 195; there is no basis for Dufour’s suggestion that the first part of the entry is a reference to Paris, BnF lat. 2390). There is, in fact, such a work: the letter “*Beatus igitur David*” followed by the psalm uses (psalms and orations) in D’Orville 45. The 1678 entry does not refer to the actual copy of the letter in this manuscript, which has a different *titulus* (“*Scriptum Alcuini ad Karolum*”) and begins in the middle of fol. 26r, so Dufour may therefore be correct in stating that D’Orville 45 was excluded from the 1678 inventories (*ibid.*, 196); but the *titulus* “*In nomine Dei summi. Incipit scriptum Albini magistri ad Karolum imperatorem*” does appear in the copy of the letter on fol. 40r of Paris, BnF lat. 2731A, and we may conclude that another copy, also followed by psalm uses, existed at Moissac as the first volume described in the January 1678 entry. This volume may have been appended to another manuscript in the following months, since the only possible reference to it in the May 1678 inventory is an entry describing a manuscript containing legal and hagiographical texts or fragments “et à la fin un écrit d’Alcuin à Charlemagne sur les psaumes de David et les prières de l’Eglise” (Dufour, *La bibliothèque*, 87), but it is also possible that the entry in the May inventory refers to a third copy of the letter at Moissac—perhaps a copy preceded by *De laude psalmorum* like the copy in Paris, BnF lat. 5338.

ulation) immediately after use 4 (in times of tribulation or temptation); this is the case in all the manuscripts containing these uses, with the exception of Paris, BnF lat. 2731A (which has use 6 before use 4 in place of the deferred use 3) and Paris, BnF lat. 5338 + 1153 (which has the uses completely reordered to fit within a ferial arrangement). This indicates that the sequence 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, 7, 8 was in the archetype behind the extant manuscripts: uses 5 and 6 were apparently transposed by the compiler responsible for the implementation of the program outlined in *De laude psalmorum*.⁶⁷

In addition to the sequence of uses, other features of the archetype are evident from the extant prayerbooks derived from it. For use 1 it contained the preexisting program consisting of the confession “Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae,” the penitential psalms with *capitula* and Psalter collects, a litany with a final set of *preces* or *capitula*, and three final liturgical collects; the remaining seven uses followed the same format, with *capitula* and Psalter collects assigned to each of the psalms and with a final set of *preces* at the end of each use. The psalms in each of the uses were indicated by incipit, but unlike *De laude psalmorum*, which has the psalms listed out of order so that those with the same incipit can be grouped together, the archetype presented the psalms for each use in numerical order.

Most of the extant manuscripts have another feature that must have been included in the archetype, the prayers “Miserere Domine, miserere Christe” and “Adesto lumen verum” at the beginning of uses 2 and 3 respectively.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ There is no evidence of this sequence in the textual tradition of *De laude psalmorum*, and the order 1–8 consecutively must therefore be considered canonical; the apparent order of the psalm uses in the archetype behind the extant prayerbooks and the unique order of the descriptions of the uses in Paris, BnF lat. 1154 (see n. 56 above) may be regarded as departures from the original sequence. Once out of the context of *De laude psalmorum*, the sequence in the archetype (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, 7, 8) was subject to further rearrangements in the compilation of such prayerbooks as BnF lat. 2731A and BnF lat. 5338 + 1153.

⁶⁸ Cologne 45, El Escorial L.III.8, Oxford, Bodleian Library D’Orville 45, Paris, BnF lat. 1153, and BnF lat. 2731A have the short prayer “Miserere Domine, miserere Christe, tu misericordia mea miserere mihi [al. mei]. Miserere Domine, miserere Christe, ut credam in te . . .” at the beginning of use 2; in its place, Paris, BnF lat. 13388 has a longer recension of the same prayer (“Miserere Domine, miserere Christe, tu misericordia mea miserere mei. Miserere Domine, miserere Christe, ut bene rogem te . . .,” fols. 66r–67r, ed. Wilmart, 123–24); in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 512 and BnF lat. 1248 neither recension of “Miserere Domine, miserere Christe” appears at the beginning of use 2, but the longer recension does appear in Mazarine 512 within use 6 (fols. 42v–43v) and in BnF lat. 1248 among the set of prayers between uses 2 and 3 (fols. 99v–100v); it also appears in BnF lat. 1153 (fols. 34v–35v, PL 101:545–46) in addition to the short recension that appears in its usual place at the beginning of use 2 (fols. 26v–27r, PL 101:537).

El Escorial L.III.8, Paris, BnF lat. 2731A, and BnF lat. 5338 have the prayer “Adesto lumen verum” (entitled *Ad laudem dei oratio pura*) at the beginning of use 3; Bibliothèque Mazarine 512 has just the incipit of the prayer at the beginning of use 3 (fol. 88v) with a ref-

Like the confession at the beginning of use 1, both were composed by Alcuin: “Miserere Domine, miserere Christe” originally formed part of Alcuin’s *De animae ratione*,⁶⁹ and “Adesto lumen verum” originally formed part of Alcuin’s *De fide trinitatis*.⁷⁰ These prayers may have been taken from their original contexts and included in uses 2 and 3 when the psalm uses with *capitula* and collects were first compiled, probably in the decades after Alcuin’s death. They are also found as isolated prayers in certain prayer collections containing neither the psalm uses nor Alcuin’s treatises.⁷¹

erence to another section of the prayerbook, where the prayer is written out in full (fols. 128v–130r); in BnF lat. 13388 just the *titulus*—*In laude dei oratio pura*—appears at the beginning of use 3 (fol. 70r, ed. Wilmart, 128), but the oration is written out in full at the end of the prayerbook (“*In laudem dei oratio pura: Adesto mihi, una spes mea, domine deus meus. Adesto lumen verum . . .*,” fols. 103v–106r, ed. Wilmart, 163–65); in BnF lat. 1248 “Adesto lumen verum” appears on fols. 97v–99v as the first of the set of prayers before use 3; in Cologne 45 it is placed on fol. 4r–v before the second psalm of use 3; and in Oxford, Bodleian Library D’Orville 45 the prayer appears at the beginning of use 3, but only the second half is included (beginning “*O beata trinitas. Deus sub quo totum . . .*,” immediately after use 2 on fol. 30v).

⁶⁹ The prayer (or litany/hymn), which—like “Adesto lumen verum”—consists of a series of verses with a refrain borrowed from a hymn of Marius Victorinus, is printed in PL 101:649–50 under the heading “*Litania seu precatio ad Christum*” among the *carmina* at the end of *De animae ratione liber ad Eulaliam virginem* (see *Clavis des auteurs latins du moyen âge: Terroire français*, 737–987. II. Alcuin, ed. Marie-Hélène Jullien and Françoise Perelman, CCCM [Turnhout, 1999], 121–25); it has also been edited by E. Dümmler, MGH *Poetae Latini Aevi Karolini*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1881), 303–4, in his edition of the *carmina* from *De animae ratione*; see also Pierre Hadot, “*Les hymnes de Victorinus et les hymnes Adesto et Miserere d’Alcuin*,” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 35 (1960): 14–15. The longer recension of the prayer, mentioned in the preceding note, does not appear in this original context and may be considered a later composition, from the first half of the ninth century.

⁷⁰ This prayer (or hymn) is printed as “*Invocatio ad sanctissimam trinitatem*” in PL 101:54–56, at the end of *De fide sanctae et individuae trinitatis libri tres* (see *Clavis des auteurs latins du moyen âge: Alcuin*, ed. Jullien and Perelman, 134–39); Hadot, “*Les hymnes*,” 9–14, presents the text with its sources in a parallel column, noting variants from selected manuscripts.

⁷¹ “Adesto lumen verum,” like “*Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae*,” appears as an isolated prayer in ninth-century manuscripts such as Orléans 184 (PL 101:1409–10). “Miserere Domine, miserere Christe,” in its original recension, usually appears in the context of Alcuin’s *De animae ratione* or in the context of use 2, but the longer recension found in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 512 and in BnF lat. 1153, 1248, and 13388 (see n. 68 above) appears as an isolated prayer in various other collections: Angers 18, fols. 175v–178r; Arras 735 (763), fols. 22r–23r; Boulogne-sur-mer, Bibliothèque municipale 20, fols. 230v–231r; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 391, p. 608 (ed. A. Hughes, *The Portiforium of St. Wulstan*, vol. 2, Henry Bradshaw Society 90 [London, 1960], 17–18); London, British Library Egerton 3763, fols. 86v–88v (ed. Odilo Heiming, “*Ein benedictinisch-ambrosianisches Gebeibuch des frühen XI Jh.*,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 8 [1964]: 410); Orléans 184 (PL 101:1408–9, followed immediately by the shorter recension); Paris, BnF lat. 1154, fols. 27v–29r; Rome, Biblioteca nazionale centrale Sessoriana 71, fol. 79v–80v, and Sessoriana 95, fol. 102v–104r (see the edition of the prayer in *De psalmorum usu*, PL 101:497–98); Subiaco, Abbazia S. Scholastica 249b, fols. 235v–236; Vatican City, BAV Chigi C VI 173, fols. 46r–47r.

The archetype of the program of psalm must have also included the brief *tituli* that appear in the extant prayerbooks for the first four psalm uses: for use 1, after the confession, the prayerbooks have variants of the title found in the preexisting program based on the penitential psalms (*Psalmi de paenitentia numero VII*); *Ad orationes speciales faciendas* and *Ad laudem dei oratio pura* appear before the respective opening prayers of uses 2 and 3; and *Oratio* (or *Psalmi*) *de quacumque tribulazione* appears at the beginning of use 4. Such concise labels, however, are not consistently included for the remaining uses. In place of a *titulus* of this sort, all the prayerbooks that include use 5 have a variant of the actual clause from *De laude psalmorum* (“Si tibi praesens vita fastidiosa sit . . .”), and four of the prayerbooks contain the clauses from *De laude psalmorum* for uses 6 and 7 as well. Two of the prayerbooks—Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 512 and BnF lat. 1248—include excerpts from *De laude psalmorum* for all the uses, but it is not clear whether the excerpts in these two prayerbooks come from the archetype of the program of psalm uses: since the excerpts in the two prayerbooks do not belong to the same branch of the textual tradition of *De laude psalmorum*, the compilers of these particular prayerbooks may have independently taken the excerpts from available copies of *De laude psalmorum* and inserted them in the psalm uses. Even if the excerpts for all eight uses were included in the archetype, the differences between the excerpts in the extant prayerbooks would still have to be accounted for by lateral influence from a manuscript containing a version of *De laude psalmorum*.⁷²

⁷² Excerpts from the text of *De laude psalmorum* are also found in a distinct program of psalm uses included on fols. 319v–322r of Paris, BnF lat. 11550, the eleventh-century psalter from Saint-Germain which contains a copy of Alcuin’s letter to Charlemagne on fol. 1r (see n. 46 above). In this manuscript, excerpts from *De laude psalmorum* are included in a program consisting of uses 1, 4 + 6 (combined), 2, 3 + 7 (combined), 5, and 8, with an additional use between uses 5 and 8. In contrast to the program in the eight prayerbooks described above, with *capitula* and a collect for each psalm, this program has the list of psalms for each use followed by one set of *capitula* and a single Psalter collect which need not belong to any of the psalms listed for that use. Since this program is not as extensive as the program in the other prayerbooks, Molin presents it before the others in his study of the psalm uses in prayerbooks at Paris (“Les manuscrits,” 123–24), preceded only by BnF lat. 1154. But unlike the program preserved in BnF lat. 1154 (see p. 25 above), the program in BnF lat. 11550 does not represent a formative stage in the development from *De laude psalmorum* to the full program of psalm uses. It may be regarded as a later application of the psalm uses outlined in *De laude psalmorum*.

The edition of *De laude psalmorum* presented below includes the excerpts of the text in BnF lat. 1154 (*Pa 1*) and BnF lat. 11550 (*Pa 4*) as well as those in the prayerbooks containing the full program of psalm uses: the excerpts for all the uses in Bibliothèque Mazarine 512 (*Maz*) and BnF lat. 1248 (*Pa 2*); the excerpts for uses 5, 6, and 7 in BnF lat. 2731A (*Pa 3*) and BnF lat. 1153 (*Opf*); and the excerpts for use 5 in Oxford, Bodleian Library D’Orville 45 (*Orv*) and Paris, BnF lat. 13388 (*Tur*).

The possibility that prayerbooks containing the program based on *De laude psalmorum* could be subject to the direct influence of manuscripts containing *De laude psalmorum* itself is just one of the problems making it difficult to reconstruct the archetype of the program found in the extant prayerbooks. The textual tradition of the program of psalm uses contains evidence of contamination from other sources as well: variants in the text of the introductory prayers for uses 1–3 could appear through the influence of manuscripts containing the prayers in the context of Alcuin's *De animae ratione* and *De fide trinitatis* or in other contexts; variants in the text of the psalm incipits and the *capitula* could appear through the influence of different versions of the Psalter or through the influence of liturgical texts based on the psalms; and variants in the Psalter collects could appear through the influence of manuscripts containing Psalter collects for all 150 psalms.

Compounding these complications in the textual tradition of the psalm uses, the extant manuscripts show considerable diversity in terms of the material with which the psalm uses are presented. Some of this devotional material is shared by two or more manuscripts and may have already been present in the archetype or at least present in a common source behind a family of manuscripts, but some of the shared material had a widespread tradition apart from the psalm uses, and we cannot always rule out the possibility that two compilers drew the psalm uses from one tradition and independently supplemented them with the same material from a separate tradition.

The edition of the psalm uses which will be presented in a separate article will show the extent to these problems can be resolved. It suffices here to note that the complex textual tradition and the diversity among the extant manuscripts in terms of the material presented with the psalm uses can also be very informative. These factors illustrate the dynamic nature of prayerbook compilation and textual transmission during the course of the ninth century, when the extant manuscripts were produced.

The most notable manuscripts in this regard are Paris, BnF lat. 5338 + 1153 (*Officia per ferias*) and Bibliothèque Mazarine 512, each of which includes additional groups of psalms with *capitula* and collects. *Officia per ferias* contains four extra uses within the same ferial framework employed for the psalm uses; the extra uses are intended for recitation in honor of the dead, in honor of the living, in commemoration of Christ's incarnation, passion, resurrection, and ascension, and in honor of the saints.⁷³ The psalms in these extra uses have the same format as those in uses 1–8, but the Psalter collects are taken

⁷³ Paris, BnF lat. 1153, fols. 39r–41r, PL 101:550–52 (after use 4 on feria iv); fols. 45v–48v, PL 101:557–60 (after use 7 on feria v); fols. 51r–54r, PL 101:562–67 (feria vi); fols. 72r–78r, PL 101:585–91 (after use 5 on Saturday).

from the Spanish series rather the Roman series.⁷⁴ The additional groups of psalms, *capitula*, and Psalter collects in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 512 are not groups intended for any occasional use or votive purpose. They form a feria program of private devotion consisting of seven psalms with *capitula* and Roman series collects for each of the seven days of the week, preceded by the prayer “Miserere Domine, miserere Christe” and followed by “Adesto lumen verum” and other prayers which vary from one feria to the next.⁷⁵ This feria program is entirely distinct from the program of eight psalm uses in the same prayerbook, and instead of psalms selected for particular uses the program includes psalms selected in numerical order over the course of the week (with 10, 12, and 15 remaining on Sunday, followed by 16, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, and 30 on feria ii, etc.). But the format is based on that of the eight psalm uses, and like the extra uses in *Officia per ferias*, they attest to importance of *De laude psalmorum* and the other compilations associated with Alcuin as models for new expressions of Carolingian devotion during the ninth century.

Since Wilmart determined that Alcuin did not compile the major prayerbooks printed under his name, Alcuin’s contribution to the history of private devotion has had to be reassessed but by no means denied. The florilegium entitled *De laude Dei* that he compiled around 790 at York—a collection of prayers, verses, and chants drawn from the Old and New Testaments, patristic sources, and the liturgy—served as a precedent for the books of private devotion produced in the ninth century;⁷⁶ one of the early Carolingian prayerbooks forms part of manuscript modelled on the manual of exegetical and devotional material which he sent to Arno of Salzburg,⁷⁷ and the letter in which he proposed a program of private prayer for Charlemagne served as a framework

⁷⁴ Psalter collects from the Spanish series are only in three of the extra uses; the original orations for the psalms in commemoration of the dead are not Psalter collects at all. A later hand has supplied the corresponding Psalter collects from the Roman series in the margins of the extra uses.

⁷⁵ The complete program occupied the original gatherings V–XI of the prayerbook, but only three fragments remain in the surviving, reordered gatherings: fol. 128r–131v, 104r–111v + 96r–103v + 120r–127v; and 112r–118r. The structure of the program is apparent from these fragments.

⁷⁶ The collection appears on fol. 133r–157r of the tenth-century manuscript, Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek Misc. Patr. 17 (B.II.10); F. Vollmer has described the work, listing in detail the contents of book 4 (fol. 148v–157r), in MGH AA 14 (Berlin, 1905), xv–xvi, and Radu Constantinescu has edited parts of books 3 and 4 (particularly the liturgical antiphons) in “Alcuin et les ‘Libelli Precum,’ de l’époque carolingienne,” *Revue d’Histoire de la Spiritualité* 50 (1974): 17–56. The collection also appears in a manuscript apparently from the mid-ninth century, El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo b.IV.17, fol. 93r–108r; see Bullough, “Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven,” 4–5 n. 10 (rpt. n. 11) and the discussion on 4–12 (rpt. 164–69).

⁷⁷ See p. 19 above.

for several prayerbooks. His apparent authorship of *De laude psalmorum* also represents a significant contribution to Carolingian devotion: this short text provided an outline of the program of psalm uses which was later implemented in ninth-century prayerbooks, utilizing prayers that Alcuin had compiled for various contexts (“Deus inaestimabilis misericordiae,” “Miserere Domine, miserere Christe,” and “Adesto lumen verum”); and during the course of the ninth century, this program served as a model for further applications of the psalms in prayerbooks such as *Officia per ferias*, one of the monumental collections of Carolingian devotion printed under Alcuin’s name.

PRINCIPLES OF THE EDITION

The first column on pp. 45–60 is an edition of the text based on the version that begins “Quia etiam prophetiae spiritus” and has the second psalm use beginning “Si vis orare” (sigla *A–E*); variants in the apparatus are indicated for manuscripts and printed texts representing other versions that formed part of the early manuscript tradition (sigla *G–N*, DHU, and BEN) and one late manuscript (*F*) that includes a concise version with readings from various early versions as well as some of the readings found in the second column. Variants from the excerpts of the text in the prayerbooks containing the psalm uses are also indicated. In the apparatus, sigla for manuscripts containing the reading adopted in the edition are only listed when the reading is attested by a minority of the manuscripts.

All psalm incipits in the edition of *De laude psalmorum* follow the Psalterium Romanum, although none of the individual manuscripts is entirely consistent in its usage of this version (which is used in Alcuin’s letters and other works). For all psalms that have separate incipits in *Rom* and *Gall* I have indicated in the apparatus the respective readings from Robert Weber, ed., *Le psautier romain et les autres anciens psautiers latins* (Rome, 1953), and *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem ad codicem fidem*, ed. Abbey of S. Jerome, vol. 10 (Rome, 1953).

The second column contains the text of Ralph of Rivo’s *Tractatus de psalterio observando* 12 and 13. I have presented the text as it appears in Mohlberg’s edition, having verified all the readings in the Brussels manuscript on which it is based; I have modified the orthography, punctuation, and capitalization of Mohlberg’s edition, but I have retained most of his editorial emendations and have made just one additional emendation (at line 125). The portions of chapter 12 that have no corresponding passages in the manuscript tradition of *De laude psalmorum* are printed in smaller type.

MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS CONTAINING *DE LAUDE PSALMORUM* OR EXCERPTS⁷⁸

Quia etiam prophetiae spiritus

Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek 2273, fols. 130v–133r, s. xv, Duisburg (Prayerbook). *Laus psalmorum s. Augustini* [Canticum + Quia].

Innsbruck, Universitätsbibliothek 261, fols. 6r–7r, s. xiv, Basel (Psalter/Bruno of Würzburg).

London, British Library Add. 37768, fol. 1r–v, s. ix med. (Lothar Psalter). [*inc. mut.* In psalmo confiteris infirmitatem . . .].

Lucca, Biblioteca Statale (Governativa) 2161, fols. 1r–40r (with Psalter collects), s. xvi. *De laude psalmorum*.

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana B 120 sup., fols. 2v–3v (see below for the version on fols. 162r–163v), s. xv, Italy (Jerome, *Tractatus in psalmos*).

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 18121, fols. 3r–4v, s. xi, Tegernsee (Psalter/Bruno of Würzburg). *De laude psalmorum*.

Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale VII.AA.7, fol. 1r–v, s. xiv, Italy (Psalter/Bruno of Würzburg). *De laude psalmorum*.

Oxford, Bodleian Library D'Orville 45, fols. 34r–35v (see below for excerpt on fol. 33r–v), s. xi, Moissac (Prayerbook/psalter with glossed hymnary) [+Quamvis textus psalterii].

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 5338, fols. 143r–144r (=first quire of *Officia per ferias*), s. ix med., Saint-Denis. *Laus psalmorum s. Augustini*.

Prague, Knihovna metropolitní kapituly O.XLII (1626), fols. 271r–272r, s. xv. *Augustinus de laude psalmorum* [+Quamvis textus psalterii diversis virtutibus . . .].

— O.LXXXIII (1657), fols. 230v–231r, s. xv. *S. Augustinus de laude psalmorum* [+Quamvis textus psalterii diversis virtutibus . . .].

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 39, fols. 39r–41v, s. xi, Heidelberg (Psalter). *Laus psalmorum s. Augustini ep.* [Canticum]; (39v) *De virtutibus psalmorum sancti dicta Augustini* [Quia. . .].

— Reg. lat. 140, fol. 106v–108v, s. ix in., Fleury (Monastic florilegium). *Sententia cuiusdam de laude psalmodiae*.

— Rossi 205, fols. 71r–74v, s. xi, Moissac (Glossed hymnary) [+Quamvis textus psalterii].

— Vat. lat. 12958, fol. 185r, s. xii, Italy (Bible with Psalterium Romanum).

⁷⁸ In compiling this list of 193 manuscripts, I have included numerous late medieval copies of the text known to me only through manuscript descriptions, the incipit files of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes and the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library, and earlier lists (esp. those for Poland, Germany, Austria, and the Czech and Slovak Republics in *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Werke des heiligen Augustinus*, vols. 3 [Franz Römer], 5 [Rainer Kurz], 6 [Dorothea Weber], and 7 [Clemens Weidmann]), which constitute the bulk of the list of ninety-one manuscripts in *Clavis des auteurs latins du moyen âge: Alcuin*, ed. Jullien and Perelman, 145–48). Although incipits and explicits are often not specified in these descriptions and lists, I have been able to ascertain enough information to classify the manuscripts by incipit and to determine whether the specified folio numbers include the text alone or combined with “Canticum psalmorum animas decorat . . .” under a single title. Nevertheless, this list must be regarded as provisional, since some of the classifications need to be verified and additions will have to be made as more copies of the text are identified.

Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 1008, fols. 186r–188r, s. IX in., Salzburg (Eucherius, *Instructiones*). *Incipit dicta s. Augustini de laude*.

——— 4002, fols. 12v–13r, s. XV, Bohemia. *Hieronymus de laude psalmorum*.

Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek M. p. th. f. 91, fols. 3r–4v, s. XV, Ebrach (Psalter/Bruno of Würzburg).

(Cf. Barcelona, Biblioteca Universitaria 760, fols. 1r–4v, s. XV. *Laus psalterium*: *Quia prophetie spiritus aliquando sanctis predicatoribus deest ... evangelizare quam prophetizare*.)

Prophetiae spiritus

Admont, Stiftsbibliothek 49, fol. 1r–v, s. XII, Admont (Augustine, *Enarrationes*). *De laude psalmorum*.

Albi, Bibliothèque municipale 45, fols. 16r–17r, s. XI, Albi (Glossed psalter). *Dicta Augustini de laude psalmorum*.

Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek theol. 118 (Q.IV.23), fols. 117r–124r, s. XIV–XV [+ *Sicut olim manna*].

Basel, Universitätsbibliothek A.III.28, s. XV [+ *Sicut olim manna*].

——— B.VII.30, fols. 33vb–34ra, s. XIII, Basel [*expl.*: *descriptos*].

Cologne, Historisches Archiv GB 8° 96, fols. 8v–10r, s. XV, Cologne. *Augustinus de laudibus et virtute psalmorum* [*Canticum + Prophetiae*].

——— W 117, fols. 138v–139r, s. XV, Cologne [*expl.*: *descriptos*].

El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo f.II.12, fols. 3r–4v, s. XV.

Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Ashburnham 221 (301–233), fols. 83r–85v, s. XV. *Dictum Hieronimi super libro psalmorum David*.

Graz, Universitätsbibliothek 87, fols. 1r–2r, s. XV, Seitz (Augustine, *Enarrationes*). *S. Augustinus de laude psalmorum*.

——— 394, fol. 111r–v, s. XV, Millstatt. *De orationibus psalmorum* [*expl.*: *descriptos*. *Hec Augustinus*].

——— 698, fols. 2r–4v, s. XII, Seckau (Augustine, *Enarrationes*). *De laude psalmorum*.

Innsbruck, Stift Wilten 32 B 4, fols. 310rb–311ra, s. XV, Tirol. *Tractatulus b. Augustini ep. de recommendatione psalterii*.

Ivrea, Biblioteca Capitolare 30 (LXXXV), fols. 5v–9v, s. XI (Psalter).

Klosterneuberg, Stiftsbibliothek 20, fols. 1v–2r, s. XII, Klosterneuberg (Augustine, *Enarrationes*). *De laude psalmorum*.

——— 1189, fols. 9r–10v, s. XIV.

Melk, Stiftsbibliothek 592 (969), pp. 236–38, s. XIV.

——— 979 (784), fol. 247r–248v, s. XV.

——— 1086 (931), p. 115–21, s. XV.

——— 1406 (484), fols. 1r–3r, s. XV. *De virtute psalmorum* [*expl.*: *omnes divinos libros*].

——— 1743 (472), p. 401–7, s. XV.

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana B 120 sup., fols. 162r–163v (see above for the version on fols. 2v–3v), s. XV, Italy (Jerome, *Tractatus in psalmos*). *De laude psalmorum*.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 4784, fols. 211r–213r, s. XV, Benedictbeuren. *Tractatus b. Augustini de recommendatione psalterii*.

——— Clm 5690, fols. 180r–182r, s. XV–XVI, Diessen. *Tractatulus b. Augustini de recommendatione psalterii*.

——— Clm 8975a, fols. 50v–61r, s. XV, Munich. *Augustinus de virtute psalmorum*.

——— Clm 11927, fols. 16r–20v, s. XV, Polling. *Tractatulus b. Augustini de recommendatione psalterii*.

— Clm 18534, fols. 202r–204v, s. xv, Tegernsee. *Augustinus de recommendatione psalterii*.

— Clm 18888, fols. 16r–19v, s. xv, Tegernsee. *Tractatulus b. Augustini de recommendatione psalterii*.

Opava, Slezský ústav RB 16, fols. 152v–153r, s. XV.

Oxford, Bodleian Library Can. Misc. 328, fols. 147v–149r, s. xv. *S. Hieronymi super laude et virtute psalmorum epistola*.

Oxford, Corpus Christi College 285, fol. 1v, s. XIII. *S. Hieronymi de laude dei super psalterium*.

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 989, fols. 23r–24r, s. xv.

Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève 1177, fol. 281r, s. XIV. *Dictum Jeronimi* (ed. Donatien de Bruyne, *Préfaces de la Bible latine* [Namur, 1920], 102–3).

Pistoia, Archivio Capitolare C.157, fol. 6v, s. XII. *De laude psalmorum*.

Prague, Knihovna metropolitní kapituly D.CXX (690), fols. 204v–207r, s. xv. *Augustinus de virtutibus psalmorum*.

Prague, Národní knihovna VIII A 26 (1434), fols. 327r–328r, s. xv.

— XI C 8 (2032), fol. 289r–v, s. XV.

Rome, Biblioteca nazionale centrale Sessoriana 71, fols. 32r–34r, s. IX ex., Nonantola (*De psalmorum usu*). *Alcuinus . . . de laude psalmorum* (=PL 101:465–68).

— Sessoriana 95, fols. 50r–53r, s. IX ex., Nonantola (*De psalmorum usu*).

Rome, Bibliotheca Casanatense 721, fol. 14r, s. XII (ed. De Bruyne, *Préfaces*, 102–3).

Salisbury, Cath. Libr. 13, fols. 2r–7v (with *De die dominica observanda*), s. XIV. *De laude psalmorum secundum Jeronimum*.

Salzburg, Erzabtei Sankt Peter b.V.7, fols. 15v–16v, s. XV. *Tractatus b. Augustini ep. de virtute psalmorum*.

— b.XI.6, fols. 27r–28r, s. XV, Salzburg.

San Marino, Huntington Library FI 5096, fols. 47r–50r, s. XV, Italy.

Sankt Paul im Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek 74/3, fols. 239r–240r, s. XV. *De laude psalmorum*.

Schlägl, Stiftsbibliothek Cpl 30 (97), fol. 8r–v, s. xv. *De laude psalmorum*.

Stuttgart, Württemburgische Landesbibliothek HB VII 46, fol. 5r–v, s. XIV (Psalterium feriatum). *Item laudes psalterii* [+ *Sicut olim manna*].

Uppsala, Universitätsbibliothek C 59, fol. 146r–v, s. XV

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Arch. S. Pietro E 14, fols. 10r–30v (*cum psalmis, capitulis et orationibus*), s. XIII.

— Reg. lat. 121, fols. 11v–12r, s. XIV (Prayerbook). *De laude et virtute psalmorum* [expl.: *descriptos*].

— Vat. lat. 9932, fols. 45r–46v, s. XIV. *Jeronymus de virtute psalmorum*.

Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 659, fol. 1r–1v, s. XII, Sittich (Augustine, *Enarrationes*).

— 666, fol. 1r–1v, s. XV, Vienna (Augustine, *Enarrationes*). *Augustinus de laude psalmorum*.

— 669, fols. 1v–2v, s. XII, Baumgartenberg (Augustine, *Enarrationes*). *Augustinus de laude psalmorum*.

— 4288, fols. 348v–349r, s. XV.

— 4381, fols. 202r–203v, s. XV.

— 4724, fols. 260r–261v, Klosterneuberg, s. XV. *De laude psalmorum*.

— Ser. nov. 26026, fol. 133r–v, s. XV.

Vienna, Schottenstift 49 (Hübl 196 [53.b.8]), fols. 117v–119r, s. XIV (Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis*). *Augustinus de laude psalmorum*.

Vienna, Theresianum 2° 25, fols. 335r–337r, s. XV. *De laude psalmorum*.

Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek 215 (CVII), fols. 187v–188r, s. XIV. *S. Augustinus*.
 ——— 279 (LXII), fols. 11r–v, s. xv (Psalter). *De laude psalmorum*.
 ——— 320 (XIX), fols. 1r–2v, s. xv (Augustine, *Enarrationes*). *De laude psalmorum*.
 Wilhering, Stiftsbibliothek IX 96, fols. 296r–297r. *Augustinus*.
 ——— IX.122, fols. 125v–127, s. xv. *Augustinus de virtutibus psalmorum*.
 Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka 217 (I.F.190), fols. 213v–214v, s. XIV. *Augustinus de virtute psalmorum* [expl.: descriptos].
 Würzburg, Franziskanerkloster I 77, s. xv. *Augustinus*.
 Zwettl, Stiftsbibliothek 23, fols. 2r–3r, s. XII, Zwettl (Augustine, *Enarrationes*). *De laude psalmorum*.
 ——— 350, fols. 21r–22v, s. xv. *Tractatus de virtutibus psalmodiae*.
 Zurich, Zentralbibliothek C 120, fols. 116r–117v, s. XIV–XV. *De commendatione psalmorum*.

Ralph of Rivo, *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis* 7, ed. Cunibert Mohlberg, *Radulph de Rivo: Der letzte Vertreter der altrömischen Liturgie*, vol. 2 (Münster in W., 1915), 11–13 (from Cologne, Historisches Archiv GB 4° 174, fols. 160v–161v, s. XIV ex. *Unde Augustinus de virtute sic dicit* [expl.: descriptos]). Cf. idem, *Tractatus de psalterio observando* 12–13, ed. Mohlberg, 214–19 (from Brussels, Bibliothèque royale 1996-2000, fols. 108v–109v [inc.: *Sicut olim manna. . . Dignum quippe est. . . Unde Gregorius: Prophetiae spiritus. . . expl: adventum domini*]); and idem, *De canonum observantia liber* 9, ed. Molhberg, 55–59 (from M. Hittorp, *De divinis catholicae ecclesiae officiis et mysteriis* [Cologne, 1568; rpt. Paris, 1610], cols. 1113–15 [inc.: *Sicut olim manna. . . Dignum quippe est. . . Unde ait Augustinus de laude et secundum alios Gregorius: Prophetiae spiritus. . . expl: descriptos*]).

Spiritus dei prophetarum mentibus

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz theol. lat. qu. 338, fols. 181v–184r, s. XV. *Tractatus beati Jeronimi de virtute psalmorum*.
 Graz, Universitätsbibliothek 1595 (39/71), fols. 62v–65v, s. XIII. *Jeronimus de virtute et laude psalmorum*.
 Cf. Ludolph of Saxony, *In psalmos*, prol. (Speier, 1491), fol. 2r–v [inc.: *Sicut olim manna. . . Dignum quippe est. . . Unde Gregorius. Spiritus dei prophetarum mentibus . . .*].

Vox enim psalmodiae cum per intentionem cordis agitur

Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale 55, fol. 16r–v, s. xv (Psalter/Book of Hours). *Prefatio in secretis psalmorum* [inc.: *Cum enim mente agitur vox*].
 Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek A 86, s. xv. *S. Gregorius*.
 Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek L 109, fols. 173r–177v, s. xv, Lichtenthal (Nuns' prayerbook). *De laude et utilitate psalmorum* [Canticum + Vox].
 Sankt Agatha/Cuijk, Kreuzherrenkloster C 16, fol. 68v, s. xv, Frenswegen.
 Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève 1363, fol. 59v, s. xv.
 Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Reg. lat. 261, fols. 67–68, s. xv.
 Cf. Dhuoda, *Liber manualis* 11.1, ed. Pierre Riché et al., Dhuoda: *Manuel pour mon fils*, 2d ed., Sources chrétiennes 225 bis (Paris, 1991), 360–69 (from Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 12293; Nîmes, Bibliothèque municipale 393; and Barcelona, Biblioteca centrale 569).

Dignum quippe est (cf. Ludoph of Saxony and Ralph of Rivo)

Vienna, Schottenstift 115 (Hübl 104 [51.c.5]), fol. 1r–v, s. xv, Budwies (Nicholas of Lyra, *Postilla super librum psalmorum*). *Augustinus in laude psalmorum*.

Nihil est in hac mortali vita

Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek II.1.2° 38, fols. 109r–110r, s. xv. *Augustinus* [expl.: difundaris].

Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek 745, fol. 206r–v, s. xv (Nicholas of Lyra, *Postillae*). *Augustinus de laude psalmorum* [inc.: Nihil est in hac vita notabilius].

Mainz, Stadtbibliothek I 39, fols. 158r–159r, s. xv. *Augustinus de laude psalmorum dicit*.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 28602, fols. 133r–134r, s. xv, Buxheim. *Augustinus de laude psalmorum sic dicit* [inc.: Nichil est in hac vita mirabili melior].

Munich, Universitätsbibliothek 2° 67, fols. 180v–181r, s. xv, Landshut. *Augustinus de laude psalmorum dicit* [inc.: Nichil est in hoc mutabili statu].

— 8° 85, fol. 265r–v, s. xv, Landshut. *Augustinus de efficacia et virtute psalmorum*. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 995, fol. 92r.

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 3349, fol. 31v, s. xv. *Epitoma s. Augustini ep.* (followed by *Laus psalmorum exposita a b. Augustino* [Canticum]).

Poppi, Biblioteca Comunale 30, flyleaf, s. XIII–XV. *Dicta b. Jeronimi presbiteri de laude et fructu psalmorum*.

Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek HB II 23, fols. 343r–344r, s. xv (Psalm commentary with Psalter collects). *Augustinus de laude psalmorum dicit* [inc.: Nichil est in hac vita mutabili].

Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Rossi 549, fols. 193r–194r, s. xv.

Nullus mortalium

Bratislava, Slovenský národný archív, Knižnica Bratislavskej kapituly 82, fols. 20v–22r, s. XV–XVI.

Cambridge, St. John's College 168 (F.31), fols. 14r–15v, s. XIII. *Augustinus doctor de psalmorum eccellenzia et proficuo*.

Herzogenberg, Stiftsbibliothek 62, fols. 60v–63v, s. xv.

London, British Library Royal 5.E.ix, fol. 86v, s. XIII. *Incipit de laude psalmorum egregie*.

Milan, Biblioteca nazionale Braidense AD.IX.14, fol. 55r, s. xv. *Gregorius*.

Prague, Knihovna metropolitní kapituly N.XLI (1565), fols. 31v–34v, s. xv. *De immensa et diversa virtute psalmorum*.

Prague, Národní knihovna IX C 10 (1721), fols. 184r–185v, s. XIV–XV. *Virtutes psalmorum*.

Třeboň, Státní Archiv A 3 (5), fols. 160r–161v, s. xv.

— A 7 (9), fols. 206r–211v, s. xv.

Cf. Uppsala, Universitätsbibliothek C 9, fol. 326v, and C 203, fol. 173v, s. xv, Vadstena (Beatus Gregorius dicit quod nullus mortalium . . .).

See also Nicholas of Lyra, *In psalmos*, germanice [Hain 13508; Stegmüller 5858] (Nota super Psalterium in glossa: Sicut olim manna . . . Nullus mortalium . . . si intento intellectu spiritali consideras. Amen. Gregorius spricht: Mit der summe der psalmen wirt zuo got ain weg berait . . .).

In psalmis itaque invenies si intenta mente perscruteris

Bratislava, Archív hlavného mesta EL 15 (I 22), fol. 148r–v, s. XV.
Uppsala, Universitätsbibliothek C 26, fol. 13v, s. XV. *Augustinus.*

Omnes etenim virtutes

Cologne, Historisches Archiv W* 8° 91, fol. 63r, s. XIII, S. *Vitus in Gladbach. Ex dictis s. Augustini.*

Eichstätt, Universitätsbibliothek st 213, 266v–267v, s. XV, Eichstätt (Glossed psalter), s. XV [inc.: *Quod omnes virtutes*].

Cf. (Hrabanus Maurus?) *Benedictio Dei*, ed. Petrus Stevartius Leodius (Ingolstadt, 1616) and printed in *Thesaurus monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et historicum* 2.2, ed. J. Basagne (Antwerp, 1725), 43–44, and in PL 129:1435–36. *Augustinus de laude psalmorum dicit: Omnes virtutes . . . [expl.: sermones dei descripti].*

Si vis pro peccatis tuis paenitentiam agere

Avignon, Bibliothèque municipale 283, fols. 116r–117r, s. XII. *Homelia s. Augustini de laude psalmorum.*

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz theolog. lat. qu. 236, fols. 84v–85r, s. XIV. *S. Augustinus de virtute psalterii dicit [expl: perscruteris].*

Cologne, Historisches Archiv GB 8° 60, fols. 31r–32r, s. XV, Cologne. *Augustinus de virtute psalterii [expl.: scruteris].*

Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek Gl. Kgl. S. 3400 8°, fols. 116v–119v, s. XV. *Augustinus de virtute psalmorum primo de septem psalmis penitentialibus: Si vis . . . psallentis se affectum confirmabit [cf. Mainz I 334].*

Dortmund, Stadt- und Landesbibliothek 5, fols. 98v–99r, s. XV. *Augustinus de virtute psalterii.*

Edinburgh, University Library 57 (Laing 10), fols. 14–15v, s. XIV, Worcester (Psalter). *Dicta Augustini de laude psalmorum.*

El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo b.II.17, fol. 286v, s. XIII (Bible addition).

Gandersheim, Stiftsbibliothek 253, fols. 194r–195r, s. XV [inc.: *Ut habeas pro peccatis veniam.*].

Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek 30, fols. 10v–11v, s. IX, St. Gall? (Psalter). *Qui psalmi in variis necessitatibus dicendi sunt [expl.: sermones dei descripti].*

Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek theolog. 4° 1552, fols. 156v–158v, s. XV, Erfurt. *Augustinus de virtute psalterii dicit [expl: perscruteris].*

Hereford, Cathedral Library P.1.13, fol. 142v, s. XIII (addition).

Koblenz, Landeshauptarchiv 701/190, fols. 124v–126v, s. XV. *De virtute psalmorum.*

London, British Library Add. 36929, fol. 1r–v, s. XIII (Psalter). *Expositio s. Augustini in psalmis [expl.: invenies].*

Mainz, Stadtbibliothek I 334, fols. 75r–76r, s. XV, Mainz. *De virtute psalmorum: Si vis . . . psallentis conformabit [cf. Copenhagen S. 3400 8°].*

Melk, Stiftsbibliothek 918 (835), fols. 97v–98r. *Augustinus [expl.: explicare potest].*

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14528, fols. 94r–96r, s. XIV.

——— Clm 14811, fols. 14r–15v, s. XV. *Augustinus de laude psalmorum.*

——— Clm 18670, fols. 8r–10r, s. XV. *De laude psalmorum.*

——— Clm 28398, fols. 104r–105r, s. XV.

Olomouc, Státní vědecká knihovna M I 214 (51), fol. 144r–v, s. XIV. *De virtute psalmorum Augustinus.*

Oxford, Balliol College 227, fol. 266r–v, s. XIII–XIV, Italy. *Expositio s. Augustini in psalmis*.

Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal 953, fol. 164r, s. xv. *Augustinus de virtute psalmorum*.

_____, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 2843, fol. 160r (margin), s. X. [use 1].

_____, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève 1439, fols. 154r–155r, s. XIII.

Prague, Knihovna metropolitní kapituly D.XIX (585), fol. 244r, s. XV [uses 1–4].

_____, N.LII (1576), fol. 250r–v, s. xv. *Prologus b. Augustini super psalmos qui propter diversas necessitates dici debent*.

Prague, Národní knihovna I F 44, fol. 1r–v, s. xv [expl.: scruteris].

_____, VIII E 28 (1553), fol. 43r, s. XIV. *Prologus b. Augustini egregii doctoris*.

_____, XIV H 7 (2652), fol. 65r–v, s. XIV. *Augustinus de virtute psalterii* [expl: scruteris].

St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 27, pp. 721–22, s. IX (Glossed psalter). *Qui psalmi in variis necessitatibus dicendi sint* [expl.: descripti].

Sankt Florian, Stiftsbibliothek XI.330, fol. 175v, s. XIV. *Prologus s. Augustini de psalmorum virtute* [use 1].

Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale G.5.2, fols. 1r–3v, s. X.

Trier, Stadtbibliothek und Stadtarchiv 1129/2054, s. xv, Trier. *De virtute psalterii*.

Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale 1742, fol. 78v (addition, s. XI), s. IX, Tours [uses 1–2 in margin].

Tübingen, Universitätsbibliothek Mc 122, fol. 118r–v, s. XIV, Italy.

Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare 149, fols. 155v–156r, s. IX, Salzburg? (Psalter).

Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek Guelf. 1394 Helmst., fols. 22v–23r, s. XV. *Prologus b. Augustini de virtute psalmorum* [inc.: Dum habes penitentiam].

Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka I.Q.37, fols. 190v–191v, s. xv. *S. Augustinus de virtute psalmorum*.

Cf. Ps.-Remigius of Auxerre, *Praeambula in psalmos*, PL 131:143.

Si vis mentem tuam spiritali gaudio et laetitia illuminari

Alençon, Bibliothèque municipale 5, fol. 229r, s. XII.

Si vis orare

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France 1154, fols. 58r–60r, s. IX–X, Saint-Martin>Saint-Martial of Limoges (Prayerbook/troper) [uses 2, 4, 6, 3, 5, 7, 8].

Lisbon, Biblioteca nacional Codices Alcobacenses CCCXCIV/426, fol. 259r, s. XIII, Portugal. *Divisio psalmorum secundum Agostinum*: Si vis orare pro peccatis. . . . Benedicite omnia opera domini [summary of uses].

Santiago de Compostela Res. 1, fol. 5r–v, s. XI (Psalter). Si vis orare pro te et de peccatis tuis penitentiam agere . . . quorum titulum est Alleluia [use 2 combined with others].

Omnipotenti deo dulce munus

Chartres, Bibliothèque municipale 1036, fols. 99v–100r, s. XIV. *Contra tribulationum temptationes . . . De fastidio vitae . . . Item in tempore temptationis . . . Tempore prosperitatis* [uses (3) 4–7].

Si diversis tribulationibus

Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek A 79, fol. 1v, s. XIII. *Augustinus de utilitate psalmorum sic diffinit* [uses 4–7, expl.: explicare potest].

Olomouc, Státní vědecká knihovna M I 162 (33), fol. 217r, s. XV. *B. Augustinus doctor egregius de virtute et utilitate psalmorum dicit*: [uses 4–7, *expl.*: explicare potest].

Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud lat. 96, fol. 251r, s. XI, Tegernsee (Psalter/Bruno of Würzburg) [use 4/6].

——— Rawl. G. 163, fol. 252r, s. XI, Tegernsee (Psalter/Bruno of Würzburg) [uses 4–7].

Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève 1369, fol. 38r, s. XII.

Prague, Knihovna metropolitní kapituly A.LXXIII,5 (125), fol. 364r, s. XIV–XV [uses 4–8, 1–3].

Rein, Stiftsbibliothek 32, fols. 129v–130r, s. XIV. *Augustinus in laudem psalmorum* [uses 4–8, 2, 3].

Zurich, Zentralbibliothek C 171, fols. 139v–140v, s. XI (Nuns' prayerbook) [uses 4–7, *expl.*: ad laudandum deum vocatur].

Post acceptam quietem

Arras, Bibliothèque municipale 735 (763), fol. 23r–v s. XI (Prayerbook) [use 7]

Si te volueris intima mente

Brno, Moravská zemská knihovna Mk 46 (II 149), fol. 24v, s. XV (Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis*, et al.). *Prologus s. Augustini de virtute psalmorum*: *Si te vis intima mente . . .* [uses 8, 1–7, *expl.*: ad laudandum dominum invitatur].

London, British Library Cotton Tiberius C.vi, fols. 22v–23r, s. XI, Winchester (Psalter) [use 8; see also the summary of uses 1–8 on fol. 27r–v, *Sententia Leonis papae: Quicunque pro peccatis . . .*].

Vienna, Schottenstift 243 (Hübl 249 [53.h.1]), fols. 113r–114v, s. XV (Orationale). *Augustinus de virtute psalmorum* [uses 8, 1–7, *expl.*: ad laudandum deum].

In psalterio solo usque ad obitum

London, British Library Royal 2.A.xxii, fol. 1r, s. XII–XIII, England (Psalter). *Laus s. Augustini super psalterium*.

Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 4272, fols. 72r–74r, s. XV–XVI, Strasegg. *Augustinus de utilitate psalmorum* [followed by uses 1–8].

[Prayerbooks uses including excerpts of the text]

Oxford, Bodleian Library D'Orville 45, fol. 33r–v (see above for full text on fols. 34r–35v), s. XI, Moissac [excerpt included for use 5].

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 512, fols. 84v–95v and 42r–48v, s. IX, Noyon [excerpts included for uses 1–4, 6, 5, 7–8].

Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 1153, fols. 21v, 42r, 66v, s. IX, Saint-Denis [excerpts included for uses 6, 7, 5].

——— lat. 1248, fols. 91r–116r, s. IX, N. France>Saint-Martial of Limoges [excerpts included for uses 1–4, 6, 5, 7–8].

——— lat. 2731A, fols. 48r–v, 50v, 51r, s. IX, Reims [excerpts included for uses 6, 5, 7].

——— lat. 2843, fol. 160r, s. X, Saint-Martial of Limoges [marginal excerpt for use 1]

——— lat. 11550, fols. 319v–322r, s. XI, Saint-Germain [excerpts included for uses 1, 4/6, 2, 3/7, 5, 8]

——— lat. 13388, fol. 76v–77r, s. IX, Tours [excerpt included for use 5].

SIGLA

A Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 1008, fols. 186r–188r, s. IX
 B London, British Library Add. 37768, fol. 1r–v [*inc. mut.*], s. IX
 C Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF) lat. 5338, fols. 143r–144r, s. IX
 D Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 12958, fol. 185r, s. XII
 E Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 39, fols. 39v–41v, s. XI
 F Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Reg. lat. 121, fol. 11v–12r, s. XIV
 G Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Reg. lat. 140, fol. 106v–108v, s. IX
 H Oxford, Bodleian Library D'Orville 45, fols. 34r–35v, s. XI
 I Rome, Biblioteca nazionale centrale Sessoriana 71, fols. 32r–34r, s. IX
 J Rome, Biblioteca nazionale centrale Sessoriana 95, fols. 50r–53r, s. IX
 K Klosterneuberg, Stiftsbibliothek 20, fols. 1v–2r, s. XII
 L Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare 149, fols. 155v–156r [uses 1–8], s. IX
 M Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek 30, fols. 10v–11v [uses 1–8], s. IX
 N St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 27, pp. 721–22 [uses 1–8], s. IX
 DHU Dhuoda, *Liber manualis* 11.1 (ed. Riché, 360–69 [MSS N P B])
 BEN *Benedictio dei* [uses 1–8] (Basagne 2.2:43–44 [PL 129:1435–36])

(excerpts of the text in prayerbook uses)

Maz Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 512, fols. 84v–95v (original quires XV–XVI) and
 42r–48v (original quire XVII) [uses 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, 7, 8], s. IX
 Pa1 Paris, BnF lat. 1154, fols. 58r–60r [uses 2, 4, 6, 3, 5, 7, 8], s. X
 Pa2 Paris, BnF lat. 1248, fols. 91r–116r [uses 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, 7, 8], s. IX
 Pa3 Paris, BnF lat. 2731A, fols. 48r–v [use 6], 50v [use 5], 51r [use 7], s. IX
 Pa4 Paris, BnF lat. 11550, fols. 319v–322r [uses 1, 4/6, 2, 3/7, 5, 8], s. XI
 Opf Paris, BnF lat. 1153, fols. 21v [use 6], 42r [use 7], 66v [use 5], s. IX
 Orv Oxford, Bodleian Library D'Orville 45, fol. 33r–v [use 5], s. XI
 Tur Paris, BnF lat. 13388, fol. 76v–77r [use 5], s. IX

DE LAUDE PSALMORUM

5

10

15

Radulphus de Rivo, *Tractatus de psalterio observando* 12–13 (Brussels, B.R. 1996–2000, 108v–109v; ed. Mohlberg, 214–19)

12. *Quod psalmi ultra omnes Scripturas alias effectus continent salutares*

Sicut olim manna habuit omne delectamentum et omnem saporem suavitatis, ita nunc psalmi habent affectum omnium orationum et sensum cuiuslibet intentionis. In choro canentium sunt verba Deum laudantis, in ore iusti verba gratias agentis, in ore peccatoris verba veniam deprecantis, pro defunctis verba animae de supplicio ad Deum clamantis, et quo(cumque) se intentio canentis converterit, illuc se mox sensus psalmorum affectui mentis conformabit. Cum benedicente benedit membra Christi ut ibi: *Benedicti vos a Domino, qui fecit caelum et terram* (Ps 113:15); cum maledicente maledicit membra diaboli ut ibi: *Maledicti, qui declinant a mandatis tuis* (Ps 118:21).

tit. DE LAUDE PSALMORUM K : praem. HOC OPUS HOC CARMEN QUOD CERNIS TRAMITE LECTOR ALCUINUS DOMINI FECIT HONORE SUI *I* : LX. SENTENTIA CIUS(DAM) DE LAUDE PSALMODIAE *G* : INCIPIT DICTA SANCTI AGUSTINI DE LAUDE *A* : LAUS PSALMORUM SANCTI AGUSTINI *C* : DE VIRTUTIBUS PSALMORUM SANCTI DICTA AUGUSTINI *E* : DE LAUDE AC VIRTUTE PSALMORUM *F* : *om. cet.*

(col. b) 13 affectui *ed.* : affectum MS

5–19 (col. b) Sicut . . . tuis: Honorius Augustodunensis, *In psalmos*, prol. (PL 172:274: “. . . Unde sicut olim. . .”) and esp. Ludolphus de Saxonia, *In psalmos*, prol.: “Sicut olim manna habuit delectamentum et omnem saporem suavitatis : sic carmen huius libri habet omne spirituale documentum (*cf. Honorius*: delectamentum) : et est conuertibile ad omnem sensum cuiuslibet intentionis. Cum in choro canitur : tunc sunt verba ecclesie deum laudantis. Cum a iustis canitur : tunc sunt verba gratias agentis. Cum a peccatore recitatur : tunc sunt verba veniam deprecantis. Cum pro defunctis decantatur : tunc sunt verba anime de supplicio ad deum clamantis. Et quocumque se intentio canentis vertit : mox se sensus huius libri affectui canentis conformabit. Cum benedicente benedit : cum maledicente maledicit, benedit membra christi : maledicit membra diaboli (*cf. Honorius*: Cum maledicente maledicit; cum benedicente benedit. Maledicit membra diaboli, ut ibi: *Maledicti qui declinant a mandatis tuis*; benedit membra Christi, ut ibi: *Benedicti vos a Domino*).” Ludolph adds a paragraph not found in Ralph of Rivo’s text: “Utile autem et salubre est intellegere quod nunquam cessamus decantare. Auget quippe deuotionem intelligentia : et dum intelligitur quod cantatur mens per intellectum obligata non euagatur. Intellectus quoque cantantium menti christum in singulis psalmis facit presentem quem dum intellectu ore decantant : procul dubio attentius amant.”

20

Dum cogitas psalmos Christus in mente tua est; dum ore decantas, Christus in ore tuo est; dum meditaris psalmos, hunc ex meditatione capies fructus, ut in ipsis tibi occurrat utrumque testamentum.

25

Psalmorum devotio praesentiam Christi conciliat, angelorum congratulationem generat, ignitos mentis affectus suscitat, mala purgat, daemones fugat gladio spiritus, quod est verbum Dei, quia devotionem psallentium sustinere non possunt. Psalmorum radices non in terra sed in caelo fixae sunt, quia ibi est Christus, qui omnium psalmorum materia est et intentio, *⟨ibi⟩* est conversatio ecclesiae, quae corpus Christi est, quae etiam permaxime psalmorum partem continet.

30

Psalmi expositiones sunt totius legis Moysis et prophetarum. Psalmi continent in se vetus et novum testamentum, ad quod signandum in quindecim gradibus continentur. Septem enim ad vetus et octo ad novum pertinent testamentum. Psalmi sunt quasi mare, in quo omnium scripturarum flumina confluunt.

35

Psalmi a fidelibus cantati tam fidelibus vivis quam defunctis possunt, sicut escae solo ore sumptae omnibus membris proficiunt. Omnes enim *in Christo unum corpus, singuli autem alter alterius membra*. Sicut enim infantes in baptismate fidem suam per patrinos pronuntiant, sic indocti vel defuncti per ora psalmos canentium Deum supplicant.

40

Devotionem psallendi docet apostolus, cum dicit prima *Ad Corinthios* decimo quarto capitulo (14:15): *Psallam spiritu, psallam et mente*. Devotioni psallentium angelicam congratulationem adesse docet

45

50

55

(col. b) 23 capies *ed.* : capias MS

20–36 (col. b) Dum . . . continet: Ludolphus, *In psalmos*, prol. (*exc. 23* fructum; 24 utrumque occurrat; 28 superat gladio; 34 christi corpus); lines 37–53 are not included.

45–48, 50–53 (col. b) Psalmi . . . supplicant: Honorius, *In psalmos*, prol., PL 172:272.

60

65

70

75

80

Quia etiam prophetiae spiritus non
semper eorum mentibus praesto est,
85 quatenus cum hunc non habent se
hunc agnoscant ex dono habere cum

psalmista, qui ait: *In conspectu angelorum psallam tibi* (138:1). Quod psallentibus angeli sancti soleant admisceri, manifestat idem psalmista, ubi ait: *Praeuenient principes*, id est angeli, *coniuncti psallentibus* (67:26). Unde cavadum est, ne propter nostram desidiam angeli recedant. Ubi enim boni spiritus se a nobis elongaverint, impetum malorum quis sustinebit? Cavadum est etiam, ne maledictionem incurramus prophetae dicentis: *Maledicitus omnis, qui opus Dei facit neglegenter* (Jer 48:10).

Dignum quippe est ut “mens nostra concordet cum voce,” quando “ad divinum opus assistimus,” et cum diligentia a praesentibus universis quisquis se retrahat et divinis inhaeret, ut ei caelestia dona revelentur. Nihil enim est in hac vita mortali in quo possimus familiarius inhaerere Deo quam in laude divina.

Psalmorum devotio Spiritui sancto mentem praeparat et omnium gratiarum dona meretur. Unde Gregorius:

“Prophetiae spiritus non semper prophetarum mentibus praesto est, quatenus cum hunc non habent tunc se cognoscant ex dono Dei habere cum

ABCDEFGHIJKDHU

83–134 *lacuna B* 83–93 Quia . . . repleret *om. DHU* 83 Quia etiam *recte om. FIJK*
prophetiae spiritus *inv. H* 84 eorum mentibus] prophetarum mentibus *IJK* : mentibus
prophetarum *F* : mentibus *H* 85 cum] add. semper *I* : semper *J* se] sed *AG* (*prius sed*
corr.) : *om. F* 86 hunc] tunc *CDE* : tunc se *F* agnoscant] agnoscant *A* : add. se
D : cognoscant *EF* ex dono habere] habuisse ex dono *F* dono] add. dei *H*

54–82 (col. b) Devotionem . . . Gregorius: Ludolphus, *In psalmos*, prol. (exc. 55–56 *om. prima* . . . capitulo; 58 congratulationem angelicam; 60 Quia; 61 admisceri sancti angeli soleant; 62 *om. idem*; 65–66 Si enim; 68 ne etiam; 74 quisque; 76 celestia ei; 77 mortali vita).

71–79 (col. b) Dignum . . . divina: see lines 106–13.

83 Quia . . . semper: cf. Gregorius Magnus, *Homeliae in Hiezechiele propheta 1.1.15*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 142 (Turnhout, 1971), 13 (see n. 14 above); cf. also *Moralia in Job 2.56.89*.

83–104 Quia . . . venimus: Gregorius, *Hom. in Hiez. 1.1.15*, ed. Adriaen, 12–13 (“Aliquando

habent. Unde propheta Heliseus, cum de futuris requisitus et prophetiae ei spiritum deesse agnovit, psalten fecit 90 applicari, ut prophetiae ad hunc spiritus per laudem psalmodiae descenderet atque eius animum de futuris repleret. Vox enim psalmodiae cum per intentionem cordis agitur, per 95 hanc omnipotenti Domino ad cor iter paratur, ut intentae menti vel prophetiae mysteria vel compunctionis gratiam infundat. Unde scriptum est: *Sacrificium laudis honorificavit me,*

habent. Unde propheta Heliseus, cum de futuris requisitus esset et prophetiae spiritum sibi deesse cognovisset, psalten sibi fecit applicari, ut prophetiae spiritus per laudem psalmodiae descenderet atque eius animum de futuris repleret. Vox etenim psalmodiae cum per intentionem cordis agitur, per hanc omnipotenti Deo ad cor iter paratur, ut intentae menti vel prophetiae mysteria vel compunctionis gratiam infundat. Unde scriptum est: *Sacrificium laudis honorificabit me,*

87 habent] haberent *EF* : habetur *GH* propheta *om. F* 88 requisitus] requisitus *C* : esset requisitus *IJ* et] ut *IJK* : *om. F* 88-89 ei spiritum *AC(prius)* : sibi spiritum recte *C(al. man. in mg.) DE* : spiritum sibi *FGHIJK* 89 agnovit] agnovisset *H* : cognovit *K* psalten] saltim *AC* : psaltem *DGHIJK* : psalterium *H* : psalterium sibi *F* 90 ut] et *ACD* : *om. G* prophetiae *om. G* 90-91 ad hunc spiritus] adhuc spiritus *CD(prius sed corr.)* : ad hunc spiritum *E* : adhuc ut spiritus *G* : spiritus ad hunc *H* : spiritus *F* 91 per] super *D* 91-92 descenderet] descendere *A* 92 atque eius] eiusque *F* de *om. F* 93-94 vox . . . agitur] cum enim intente agitur vox psalmodiae *F* 93 enim *om. G* psalmodiae] psalmorum *H* 94 per¹ *om. G* cordis] mentis *CE* : mentibus *D* agitur] augetur *A* : agatur *D* 95 domino *A* : deo *GHJKDHU* : *om. CDEF* iter] itur *G* 96 paratur] paratus *GIJ* intentae] intenti *AG(al. man.) J DHU* : intenta *D* : *om. F* menti] mente *D* : *om. F* 97 mysteria] mysterium *DHU* 98 gratiam] add. ma? et del. *G* : add. meditantibus *DHU* 98-104 Unde . . . venimus *om. F* 99 sacrificium] sacrificio *H* honorificavit] honorificabit *DJKDHU^P* : honorificabis *DHU^{NB}*

uero prophetiae spiritus prophetis deest, nec semper eorum mentibus praesto est, quatenus cum hunc non habent, se hunc agnoscant [ad h. cogn. MS *G*] ex dono habere cum habent. Vnde Heliseus cum . . . eum Iosaphat de futuris requereret, et prophetiae ei spiritus deesset, psalten fecit applicari, ut prophetiae spiritus ad hunc [s. a. h. *G* : a. h. s. *cet.*] per laudem psalmodiae descenderet atque eius animum de uenturis repleret. Vox enim [etenim *G*] psalmodiae cum per intentionem cordis agitur, per hanc omnipotenti Domino ad cor iter paratur, ut intentae menti uel prophetiae mysteria uel compunctionis gratiam infundat. Vnde scriptum est: *Sacrificium laudis honorificabit* [-uit *G*] *me*, et illic iter est quo [in quo *G*] ostendam illi salutare Dei. . . . In sacrificio igitur laudis fit Iesu [in Iesu *G*] iter ostensionis, quia dum per psalmodiam compunctionis effunditur, uia nobis in corde fit per quam ad Iesum in fine peruenitur”).

83-105 (col. b) Prophetiae . . . pervenitur: Ludolphus, *In psalmos*, prol. (exc. 83-86, Spiritus dei prophetarum mentibus non semper presto est quatenus cum spiritum propheticum non habent, sed hunc cognoscant; 90, psalterium; 91, spiritus ad eum; 98, Unde ps. xlix scriptum; 101-2, laudis fit ad iesum iter ostensionis; 105, in fine ad iesum peruenitur. Hec Gregorius).

87-93 Unde . . . repleret: Cf. 4 Reg 3:15.

99 Ps 49:23 (Rom: honorificavit; Gall: -bit; Span: -bis).

100 et reliqua. In sacrificio igitur divinae laudis fit in Iesu iter ostensionis, quia dum per psalmiodiam compunctio effunditur, via nobis in corde fit per quam ad Iesum venimus.

105 et illic iter, quo ostendam illi salutare Dei. In sacrificio igitur divinae laudis manifeste fit iter ad Iesum, quia dum per psalmiodiam compunctio infunditur, via nobis in corde fit per quam ad Iesum in fine pervenitur.”

Dignum quippe est ut dum mens a praesentibus universis in quantum valet se emundat, et divinis, caelstibus atque spiritualibus se inhaereat,

110 ut caelestia ei revelentur. Nihil enim est in hac mortali vita in quo possimus familiarius nos superis civibus inhaerere quam divinis laudibus.

115 Nullus itaque mortalium potest nec verbis nec mente virtutem psalmorum,

13. *De multimoda psalmorum virtute*

Nullus mortalium virtutem psalmorum pleniter explicare poterit, nam to-

100 et reliqua] etc. DHU : et illic iter quod ostendam illi salutare dei IJ : et illic est quo o. i. s. d. K : om. D divinae] divini A 101 fit] sit A in Iesu] ad Ihesum IJ : ad dominum K quia] viae C(e via) 102 compunctio] compuncto A 103 via] viam G(prius sed corr.) 104 Iesum] illum K venimus] veniamus GHIJDHU 106 est om. D(prius sed corr.) dum om. GHIJKDHU mens] add. nostra concordet voci nostrae quando ad opus divinum assistimus, et H 107 universis] add. malis H : om. F 108 valet] valeat AE se emundet om. H emundat AD(prius) : emendat CD(al. man.) F : emundet EK : mundet GHIJDHU et] ut F : om. D divinis] add. et GH 108–9 caelstibus] add. -que C(sup. lin.) : laudibus FIJK 109–10 atque . . . ei] intente et ad caelestia secreta se levare studendo spiritualia F 109 se om. IJK inhaereat] erigit D 110 caelestia ei inv. C(e c. e.) : caelestia D : caelestia dona ei H revelentur] revelantur A 110–13 Nihil . . . laudibus om. F 110–11 enim est] est AGIJDHU : est enim H 111 hac] hoc A quo] qua GHDHU 111–12 possimus] possumus AD 112 familiarius nos superis civibus] nos familiarius GDHU : nos familiarius deo H : deo familiarius IJK superis] supernis D 113 divinis] in divinis psalmodiae DHU : in divinis H : ipsis in I : in ipsis J 115 nec om. CDEF 116 verbis] verbo IJ nec] aut CDEF 116–19 virtutem . . . explicare] virtutem psalmorum explicare F : psalmorum explicare virtutes. Eiusdem. DHU

106 Dignum quippe est ut . . . mens: cf. Gregorius, *Moralia in Job* 3.33.64

mens (var.): *Regula Benedicti* 19, ed. R. Hanslik, CSEL 75 (Vienna, 1977): “sic stemus ad psallendum, ut mens nostra concordet uoci nostrae” (82); “cum ad opus diuinum adsistimus” (81).

115–19 (esp. col. b) Nullus . . . laudibus: Alcuinus, Ep. 243, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epistole 4 (Berlin, 1895), 391 (see p. 13 above). Cf. Ludolphus, *In psalmos*, prol.: “Nullus itaque mortalium potest vel verbo explicare : vel animo comprehendere psalmorum virtutem : si non superficie labiorum tantum sed intenta mente et puro corde in diuina laude canantur.”

quae non superficie labiorum sed intenta mente in omnipotentis Dei laude cantatur, explicare.

120 In psalmis itaque invenies, si intenta mente perscruteris et ad spiritalem intellectum perveneris, dominici Verbi incarnationem passionemque et resurrectionem atque ascensionem.

125 In psalmis invenies tam intimam orationem, si intenta mente perscruteris, sicut non potes ullatenus per te ipsum excogitare. In psalmis invenies intimam confessionem peccatorum tuorum et integrum depreciationem divinae atque dominicae misericordiae. In psalmis quoque invenies omnium rerum quae tibi accedunt intimam gratiam actionum. In

tus psalmorum liber caelestibus redolet mysteriis, spiritualibus abundat praecaptis, divinis repletus est laudibus.

In psalmis invenies, si intenta mente scruteris *<et>* ad spiritualem intelligentiam perveneris, divini Verbi incarnationem, passionem, resurrectionem atque ascensionem. In psalmis invenies, si intente non celeriter perscruteris, tam intimam orationem, qualem non poteris per te ipsum ullatenus cogitare. In psalmis invenies intimam confessionem peccatorum tuorum et integrum depreciationem divinae misericordiae. In psalmis quoque invenies praesidium contra adversitates omnium rerum, quae tibi accident, et intimam de omnibus gra-

117 quae] *add.* si *H* labiorum] *add.* tantum *H* sed] *sic D* : *se E* 118 mente] *add.* et puro corde *H* in . . . laude *om. E* laude] laudem *AC(prius sed corr.) K* 119 cantatur] cantatur *G(prius sed corr.)* : canantur *H* : canitur *IJK* explicare] explicere *AC(prius sed corr.)* 120–22 In . . . perveneris] si intentus desideres in psalmis invenies *F* 120–21 intenta] intima *H* 121 perscruteris] perscrutaveris *H* 121–27 et . . . perscruteris *om. D* 121–22 et . . . perveneris *om. C* 122 perveneris] pervenis *DHU* 124 et *om. F* atque] ac *F* ascensionem] *add.* Eiusdem *DHU* 125–28 In . . . excogitare *om. F* 126–27 perscruteris] perscrutaveris *H* 127 sicut] *quanta IJ* : *quantam K* non *om. D* ullatenus] nullatenus *D* 127–28 ullatenus . . . ipsum] per te ipsum ullatenus *GHIJKDHU* 128 excogitare] *add.* Item *DHU* 130 tuorum *om. EF* 131 divinae] *add.* indulgentiae *AK* atque dominicae *om. F* 132 misericordiae] *add.* quoque *D* : *add.* Eiusdem *DHU* psalmis] psalmo *C* 132–33 In . . . omnium] omniumque *F* 133–34 accedunt] accident (*e accedunt K*) 134 intimam] intima *DHU* gratiam actionum] gratiarum actionem *EFIJK* : gratiam actionem *G* : actionum. *Eiusdem. DHU*

(col. b) 117 caelestibus *ed.* : ex legibus *MS* 125 intente non *scripti* : intenta ratione *MS et ed.* 130 integrum] intimam *MS*

117 non superficie labiorum: cf. Cassianus, *De institutis coenobiorum* 4.39.2, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 17 (Vienna, 1888), 75 (“. . . si semet ipsum cunctis inferiorem non superficie pronuntiet labiorum monachus, sed intimo cordis credat affectu”); and cf. Augustinus, *Enarrationes in psalmos* 48.1.5.

124–40 (col. b) In . . . secreta: Ludolphus, *In psalmos*, prol. (exc. 128, excogitare; 131, diuine atque dominice misericordie; 132, *om. quoque*; 134–35, intimam gratiarum actionem de omnibus; 140, ut tibi psalmorum virtutem reuelet).

135 psalmis confiteris infirmitatem tuam atque miseriam, et per idipsum misericordiam Dei ad te provocas. Omnes etenim virtutes in psalmis invenies, si a Deo merueris ut tibi revelet secreta psalmorum.

140 1. Si vis pro peccatis tuis paenitentiam agere et confessionem peccatorum tuorum et veniam rogare delictis, quantum valeas intente, non celeritate verborum sed mente cogitando ac scrutando, decanta septenos davidicos paenitentiae psalmos quorum initium est: duo *Domine, ne in*

145

tiarum actionem. In psalmis confiteris infirmitatem tuam atque miseriam et per hoc provocabis Dei misericordiam. Omnes enim virtutes in psalmis reperies, si a Deo merueris ut tibi revelet psalmorum secreta.

Si vis pro peccatis paenitentiam agere et confessionem pro delictis peccatorum tuorum et veniam rogare, quantum potes intente, non celeritate verborum sed mente cogitando et scrutando, decanta septenos davidos paenitentiae psalmos,

135 psalmis] psalmo *BCGDH^{PN}* confiteris] quoque confiteris *DHU* : vero conferis *H* 135–36 infirmitatem . . . miseriam] miseriam atque infirmitatem tuam *F* 136 miseriam] misericordiam *G* idipsum] ipsam *DHU* : ipsos *H* 136–37 misericordiam . . . provocas] invidatis dei misericordiam *F* 137–40 Omnes . . . psalmorum] Si a deo merueris ut tibi revelet secreta psalmorum omnes in eis virtutes invenies *F* : *hic incipit BEN* 138 etenim] enim *GHJ* *DHU* : *om. BEN*

1. *ABCDEFGHIJKLMNDHUBEN | MazPa2Pa4*

141 si] et si *H* 141–44 pro . . . intente] peccatorum confessionem et paenitentiam agere *F* 141–42 paenitentiam agere] veram agere paenitentiam *Maz* 142 confessionem] cum confessione *GH* : confessione *IJPa4* : add. et *DHU* 142–43 peccatorum . . . veniam] ac veniam puram pro eis *Maz* 143 tuorum *om. D* et] veniam *G(postea del.)* : a deo *H* : *om. IJ* *DHUPa4* 144 delictis] add. in *A(postea del.)* : pro delictis *BCDKNPa2Pa4* : *om. HMaz* 144–55 quantum . . . promittere] septem paenitentiae psalmos non cursu verborum caeleriter sed intenta mente decanta *Maz* valeas] vales *BGHJKDHUPa4* intente] intento *A* : intenta *CPa2* : intenta mente *BDH* : intende *DHU* : *om. BEN* non *om. D* 145 mente] intenta mente *F* : puro corde *H* 145–46 cogitando *om. F* 146 ac *om. FHMN* scrutando] servando *Pa4* : *om. FMN* decanta *om. D* 146–47 decanta . . . psalmos] hos psalmos decanta *H* septenos davidicos *inv. EK* 146 septenos] septenus *C(prius sed corr.)* : septem *D* 147 paenitentiae psalmos] psalmos *GIJ* *DHU* : *inv. MN* 147–51 quorum . . . profundis *om. F* 147–48 quorum . . . est *om. HMN* 148 initium] initio *Pa4* est *om. IJ* duo *om. HMNPa2Pa4*

(col. b) 142–43 confessionem . . . et veniam *MS* : confessione . . . veniam *ed.*

141–44 Si . . . delictis: cf. Rufinus, *Apologia contra Hieronymum* 2.14, ed. M. Simonetti, CCL 20 (Turnhout, 1961), 94 (“Quod si uere pro maledictis tuis uis agere paenitentiam”).

148–51 Pss 6/37 (*Rom*: Domine ne in ira tua; *Gall*: Domine ne in furore tuo); 101/142; 31; 50; 129.

150 *ira tua; et duo Domine, exaudi; Beati quorum; necnon et Miserere mei, Deus, secundum; atque De profundis; et celerrimam invenies clementiam Dei totam mentem spiritali gaudio ac laetitia inluminare, et magnam spem*
 155 *Dei indulgentiae tibi promittere.*

2. Si vis orare, permitte mentem tuam in virtute psalmorum quorum initium est: *Ad te, Domine, levavi animam meam; et Deus, in te speravi, Domine; necnon Inclina, Domine; et*

et celerrimam invenies clementiam Dei et magnam spem indulgentiae.

Si vis orare, laxa mentem tuam in virtute psalmorum quorum initium est: *Ad te, Domine, levavi animam meam; In te, Domine, speravi, non confundar; Inclina, Domine; Deus, in*

149 *ira tua AGJL: ira BEN: furore tuo BCDEIKDHU: f. t. I HNPa2: f. t. II M: f. Pa4 et duo om. HMNPa2Pa4 Domine exaudi] add. II M: add. et BEN: om. HNPa2Pa4*
 150 *quorum] add. remissae sunt K necnon et BCDGLDHU: necnon ABEN: et IJK: Do- mine ne in furore tuo II HNPa2: D. n. i. f. II Pa4: om. EM 151 secundum] add. magnam misericordiam B: add. magnam GHJLDHU^B: add. I Pa2: om. EKMPa4 atque] et EIJ: Do- mine exaudi orationem I HN: D. e. I Pa2Pa4: om. M profundis] add. clamavi: add. clamavi. Domine exaudi orationem meam II H: add. D. e. II NPa2Pa4 152–55 et . . . promittere] et invenies quod petis. Amen MN: om. Pa4 152 celerrimam] celerrime FGHIJ DHU invenies] experies F clementiam dei inv. BCDPa2 153 totam ABCDEL BENPa2: Si vis GHJLDHU: om. F mentem] add. tuam FGHIJKDHU ac] et IJ: om. EF 154 laetitia] laetitiam G(prius sed corr.): om. EF inluminare] inluminari IJ 154–55 et . . . promittere om. DHU 155 dei] de dei IJK: de BENPa2: tibi F indulgentiae AFL: indulgentiam BCDEGHPa2: indulgentia IJK BEN tibi om. F promittere] promittat D*

2. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPDHU BEN | MazPa1Pa2Pa4

156–57 *Si . . . psalmorum] decanta prompta mente hos psalmos DHU 156 Si] et si GHJK orare] add. deum Pa1 permitte] mitte IJK: laxa F: om. GH mentem tuam] pro mente tua GH 157–58 quorum initium est] intima mente hos psalmos decanta H: quorum istud initium est, et statim illius misericordiam invenire poteris Pa4: om. MNMaz 158–64 Ad . . . meam om. Maz(pss. 16, 24, 53, 66, 69, 70, 85 cum cap. et coll.) 158–59 Ad te domine levavi animam meam AB: A. t. d. l. a F: A. t. d. l. CDELMNBEN Pa1: Ex- audi domine iustitiam meam GHJJKPa2DHU: E. d. i. Pa4 159–60 et Deus . . . domine ACLBEN: In te domine speravi non confundas II B: I. t. d. s. DFM: I. t. d. s. II EPa1: I. t. d. s. I N: Ad te domine levavi a. m. KDHU^BPa2: A. t. d. l. a. H: A. t. d. l. IJDHU^{PN}Pa4: om. G 160 necnon] et DHU: om. EGHJJKMNPa1Pa4 Inclina domine ABCDEFBEN: add. aurem Pa1: Deus in nomine tuo salvum (e psalmum) me fac et (add. in) vir G: D. i. n. t. HJLMNDHUPa4: I. t. d. s. Pa2: om. K et ABCDLBEN: om. EFGHIJKMNDHUPa1Pa2Pa4*

158–64 Pss 24; 70 (*Rom*: Deus in te speravi domine; *Gall*: In te domine speravi; cf. *Rom* Ps 30: In te domine speravi); 85; 69 (*Rom*: Domine deus in adiutorium meum; *Gall*: Deus in a. m.); 53; 66 (*Rom*: Deus misereatur nobis; *Gall*: Deus misereatur nostri); 16.

165 *Domine Deus, in adiutorium meum; Deus, in nomine tuo; Deus misereatur nobis; Exaudi, Domine, iustitiam meam; et nullatenus potes tua propria lingua nec humano sensu tam perfecte miseriam tuam ac tribulationem angustiamque diversarum temptationum explicare et illius misericordiam implorare quam in his psalmis et ceteris his similibus.*

170 **3.** *Si vis omnipotentem Deum laudare et ipsius maiestati omniumque beneficiorum suorum quibus humano generi ab initio mundi, in veteri tes-*

adiutorium; Deus, in nomine; Deus misereatur; Exaudi, Domine, iustitiam meam; et nullatenus potes tua propria lingua nec humanus sensus tam perfecte miseriam tuam ac tribulationem angustiamque diversarum temptationum explicare et illius misericordiam implorare quam in his psalmis et ceteris his similibus.

Si vis omnipotentem Deum et ipsius maiestatem laudare omniumque beneficiorum suorum quibus humano generi ab initio mundi, in veteri tes-

161 Domine deus in adiutorium meum *ACL* : Deus i. a. m. *BD BEN* : Deus i. a. *EFPal* : Deus misereatur nostri *GHIDHUPa4* : D. m. nobis *J* : In te domine speravi *II K* : Inclina domine aurem *MN* : I. d. *Pa2* 162 Deus in nomine tuo *ACDEKL BENPal* : et D. i. n. t. *B* : Deus in adiutorium meum intende *G* : D. i. a. m. *HMNPa2* : D. i. a. *IDHUPa4* : Domine deus i. a. *J* : Deus misereatur *F* 162–63 Deus misereatur nobis *A* : Deus misereatur nostri *BDEKLMNBENPal* : Deus misere- (*lacuna 162–251*) *C* : In te domine speravi *G* : et I. t. d. s. necnon *DHU* : I. t. d. s. *II HI* : Deus in te speravi *J* : I. t. s. *Pa4* : Deus in adiutorium meum *K* : Deus in nomine tuo *FPa2* 163–64 Exaudi domine iustitiam meam *ABDELN* : et E. d. i. m. *BEN* : E. d. i. *FMPal* : Inclina domine aurem tuam *GH* : I. d. a. meam *Pa4* : I. d. *IDHUPa4* : I. *J* : Deus in adiutorium meum *K* : Deus misereatur nostri *Pa2* 164–70 et . . . similibus] et tunc misericordiam dei citius impetrare valebis fidenter *DHU* : *om. MNPa4* 164 potes *BIJKPal* : poteris *BEN* : potest *DEGHL* : potestas *A* : poterit *Maz* : *om. Pa2* 164–65 potes . . . sensu] humanus sensus potest *F* tua propria] tua *AD* : propria tua *E* : propria *BEN* 165 lingua] *add. propria D* humano sensu] humanus sensus *EMaz* 166 miseriam] misericordiam *G* (*prius sed corr.*) *Maz* : *om. Pal* tuam *om. BFMazPal* : *del. D* 166–67 ac . . . angustiamque] a tribulationibus et angustiis et *Pal* 167 angustiamque diversarum] suam angustiasque *F* 168 temptationum] temptationumque *A* : tribulationum *G* (*e tribulationem*) *H* : *add. poterit Pa2* 168–69 et . . . implorare *om. K* 168 illius] illis *E* : domini *Maz* 168–69 illius misericordiae] misericordiae dei *F* 169–70 implorare . . . similibus] implorare *F* : tuis petitionibus promptam habere *Maz* 169 in *om. BEN* 170 ceteris] in *H* : in ceteris *LPa2* his *om. D*

3. AGMNEBIJHPalDL DHU BEN | MazPa2

171–72 Si . . . ipsius] *illeg. Pa2* omnipotentem . . . maiestati] maiestatem dei laudare *F* 171 deum *om. Maz* 172 et *om. MN DHU Maz* ipsius maiestati] ipsius maiestatem *GHIKDHU* : *om. MNMaz* omniumque] omnium *DBEN* 172–73 omniumque . . . suorum] pro omnibus beneficiis suis *B* 173 suorum] *add. deprecare H* : *om. Pal* 173–77 quibus . . . est *om. F* 173–74 humano . . . mundi] ab initio mundi humano generi *H* 174 ab initio mundi *om. MNMaz* 174–77 in . . . sui *om. DHU* 177 veteri] veteri ac novo *MN* : novo ac veteri *Maz* 174–75 veteri testamento] veteris testamenti *Pal*

175 tamento per patriarchas ac prophetas, in novo quoque per incarnationem sempiterni filii sui, misertus est gratias agere, decanta illos psalmos quorum titulus *Alleluia* est et quorum initium est vel *Confitemini Domino* aut *Laudate Dominum* vel *Laudate Deum* aut etiam *Benedic anima mea Dominum*; et omne mel et favum omnipotenti Deo dulce munus offeres,

180 tamento per patriarchas et prophetas et in novo per incarnationem filii sui benedicti, misertus est gratias agere, decanta illos psalmos quorum titulus est *Alleluia*, quorum initium est vel *Confitemini* vel *Laudate Dominum* aut etiam *Benedic*; et super omne mel et favum omnipotenti Deo dulce munus offers hisque psalmis illum continue laudas ac magnificas.

175–77 per . . . sui *om. MNMaz* 175 ac prophetas] et prophetas *DG* : *om. B* 176
 quoque] que *G(prius sed corr.)* 177 sempiterni] sempiternam *GH* : *om. EPal* sui]
add. sempiterni E : *om. BDHPa2* misertus] concedere dignatus *DHU* est *om. Pal*
 177–78 gratias agere] quantulumcumque scire *DHU* : agere gratias *Maz* 178 decanta illos
 psalmos] illos psalmos decanta *MNMaz* : decanta hos psalmos *G* : hos psalmos decanta
H : decanta psalmos *F* 178–83 quorum . . . dominum] *Benedic anima mea I*, *Benedic*
anima mea II, *Confitemini domino I*, *C. d. II*, *C. d. III*, et omnes psalmos quorum titulus initium
 est *Alleluia H* 179 titulus *Alleluia est*] *Alleluia* titulum est *L* : *om. Maz(prius sed corr.)*
 179 titulus] titulum *AGDHU^{BN}* : titulo *D* *Alleluia* est *inv. EFGKMN* : *om. J(eras.)* et]
haec BEN : *om. GDHU* 179–82 et . . . etiam *om. F* 179–80 quorum² . . . vel *om. Maz*
 180 est *om. APal* vel *om. DGKMN* *DHU* *Pal* *Confitemini domino*] *add. et invoke*
Pal : *Confitemini BDEIJK* *BEN* : *om. Maz* 181 aut *om. GDHUMaz* *Laudate dominum*]
add. omnes gentes Pal : *add. o. Pa2* : *Laudate D* : *Lauda anima mea dominum G* 181–
 82 vel *Laudate deum AKMBEN* : vel *L. dominum* *Pa2* : *L. dominum* *DHU^B* : *L. dominum*
quoniam bonus G : *Benedic anima I* *Pal* : *om. BDEGJLN* *DHU^{PN}* *Maz* aut etiam] aut *L* : et
MDHUMaz : vel *N* : *om. GPal* 182–83 *Benedic anima mea dominum AGN* : *B. a. m.*
domino BDEFML *DHU* *Maz* *Pa2* : *B. a. mea mea domino D* : *B. a. m. IJK* *BEN* : *Laudate*
dominum de caelis Pa1 183 et] *add. sacrificium dulce F* : *om. DHU* omne] omnem
AE : omnium *G* : super omne *BI(prius sed corr.)* *J* *BEN* *Maz* : super *F* : omni *N* mel] melle *N*
et aut *K* favum] favo *N* 184 omnipotenti . . . offeres] offeres omnipotenti *F* omnipotenti
deo om. H dulce] dulciora *N* offeres] offeres *DHU* : offerens *Pal*

174–75 In . . . prophetas: cf. Hieronymus, *Tractatus in Ps 88*, ed. G. Morin, CCL 78 (Turnhout, 1958), 406 (“tunc locutus sum in ueteri testamento per patriarchas et per prophetas”).

179–83 Pss 102–3 (*Rom*: *Benedic anima mea dominum*; *Gall*: *B. a. m. domino*); 104–6 (*Alleluia. Confitemini domino*); 110–15 (*Alleluia*); 116 (*Alleluia. Laudate dominum*); 117 (*Alleluia. C. d.*); 134 (*Alleluia*); 135 (*Alleluia. C. d.*); 145 (*Alleluia*); 146–50 (*Alleluia. L. d.*). Ps 118 (*Alleluia*) is not listed here, since it constitutes use 8; Ps 102 appears in use 7 but is also listed here, since the prayerbooks based on the eight uses include it in both uses. It should also be noted that the list of psalms for use 3 printed in the preface to *De psalmorum usu* (PL 101:466–67) does not appear in the Nonantola manuscripts or in any other source known to me.

181–82 *Laudate deum*: cf. Ps 150 (*Rom* *Gall*: *Laudate dominum*; *Ambr*: *Laudate deum*).

183–84 mel . . . dulce: cf. Ps 18:11 (dulciora super mel et favum); Ps 118:103 (*Rom*: quam dulcia fauibus meis eloquia tua super mel et favum).

185 si his psalmis continue illum laudes
ac magnifices.

190 4. Si diversis tribulationibus afflictus sis et vel humanis vel spiritualibus temptationibus undique adstrictus, et tibi videtur te a Deo esse derelictum, qui plerumque sanctos suos ad tempus derelinquit probandos, et per id tibi videatur temptatione maior esse quam tolerare possis, intima mente decanta illos psalmos quorum caput est: *Deus, Deus meus, respice in me; Exaudi, Deus, orationem meam, cum tribulor; Salvum me fac, Deus*

Si diversis tribulationibus afflictus sis et vel humanis vel spiritualibus temptationibus turbaris tibique videatur, ut derelictus sis a Deo, qui plerumque sanctos suos ad tempus derelinquit probandos, et per id tibi videatur temptatione maior esse quam tolerare possis, intima mente decanta psalmos illos quorum caput est: *Deus, Deus meus, respice in me; Exaudi, Deus, orationem meam, cum deprecor; Salvum me fac, Deus, quo-*

185–86 si . . . magnifices *om. FMNMaz*
continue] continuo *BPa1Pa2(prius sed corr.)*
ac] hoc *A magnifices* *E*

185 his] in his *BHJDHU* psalmis *om. Pa1*
illum *om. Pa1* 186 laudes] laudas *E*

4. *ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPDHUBEN | MazPa1Pa2* (cf. *Pa4 infra 211*)

187 Si] Item si *DHU* 187–88 diversis . . . vel¹ *om. F* 187 tribulationibus]
tribulationis *I* (*e* tribulationibus) *J* 188 sis] es *MN: om. GHDHU* et *om. GHPa1*
vel¹ *om. MNMaz* 189 temptationibus] tribulationibus *Pa2* undique adstrictus] affli-
geris *F* et] ut *F: om. D* 190 tibi videtur te *BDPa2* : tibi videtur *AEGHIJKLDHUPa1* :
videris te *MNMaz* : videris *BEN* : *om. F* esse] te esse *H* : tibi videaris *F: om. GMNDHUMaz*
derelictum] datum *D* : derelictus *FIJBEN* 191–94 qui . . . possis *om. MNMazPa1*
191 qui *om. F* suos *om. BEN* 191–94 ad . . . possis] ut probentur a Deo derelinquit *F*
192 derelinquit] dereliquid (-t) *ADIJL(prius sed corr.)* probandos . . . id] probandos (*e*
probrandos) ut per haec *Pa2* 193 videatur *ABDEIJLPa2* : videtur *GHKDHUBEN* tempta-
tio maior *BDEIJPa2* : temptationem maiorem *GHKL* (*e* -num maiorem) *DHUBEN* : temptation-
num maiorem *A* 194 tolerare] tolerari *A BEN* possis] possit *ALBEN* : non possis *H*
intima mente] intimo mente *AL* : intima mentem tuam et *Pa1* : *om. MNMaz* 195–
96 decanta . . . est] hos psalmos decanta *HMN* : hanc prius confessionem cum psalmis
sequentibus et oratione subsequenti decantare oportet *Maz* 195 illos] hos *G: om. F*
psalmos] spalmos *E* caput] initium *GDHU* 196 est *om. BEN* 196–201 Deus . . .
poteris *om. Maz* (*pss. 21, 63, 68 cum cap. et coll.*) 196 in me] me *BHNPa2* : add. et
D: om. EMDHU 197 orationem] deprecationem *D* : d. (mean) et *Exaudi deus oratio-*
neMDHU : mean *om. Pa1* 198 cum tribulor *AJBEN* : cum deprecor *DEFGHIKLM*
DHU *Pa2* : dum deprecor *N* : *III B* : cum *Pa1* me *om. Pa1* fac *om. N* deus] add.
quoniam intraverunt aquae *Pa2* : add. q. i. *BH* : add. q. *DPa1* : add. *I N* : domine q. i. *F*

(col. b) 193 videatur] videtur MS

196–98 *Pss 21; 63 (Rom: . . . cum tribulor; Gall: . . . cum deprecor)*; 68.

et clemens Deus statim te adiuvet et
200 temptationem quam patiaris tolerare
poteris.

5. Si tibi praesens vita fastidiosa
sit, et animum tuum delectet super-
205 nam patriam contemplare et omni-
potentem Deum ardentи desiderio,
intenta mente hos psalmos decanta:
Sicut cervus; et Quam amabilia sunt;
Deus, Deus meus, ad te de luce vi-

niam intraverunt; et clemens Domi-
nus statim te adiuvat, ut temptatio-
nem quam pateris tolerare possis.

Si tibi praesens vita fastidiosa sit,
et animum tuum delectet supernam
patriam contemplari et omnipoten-
tem Deum videre, ferventi desiderio
et intenta mente hos psalmos de-
canta: *Quemadmodum; Quam dilecta;*
Deus, Deus meus; et clemens Deus

199–201 et . . . poteris] et deus clemens statim pondus temptationum alleviabit tibi *F*
199 et . . . statim] statim *GH* : et statim *DHU* : et statim clemens *Pa1* [deus] dominus *BEN*
te] add. *christus H* : om. *MN* adiuvet *ADLPa1Pa2* : adiuvat *EGHIJKDHU^{NB}* : adiuvabit
BDHU^P BEN : adiuvabit te *MN* et *ABIKL BENPa1* : ut *DEGHMNDHUPa2* temptationem] temptationes *H* : om. *MN* quam . . . poteris] tolerare possis ea quae pateris *M* : t. possis
quae pateris *N* quam] quas *H* patiaris *ADELPa2* : pateris *BGHIJK BENPa1* : patereris
DHU tolerare] sustinere *K* poteris *BDE BENPa1Pa2* : potes *AJJKL* : possis *GHDHU*

5. *ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPDHUBEN | MazPa1Pa2Pa3Pa4OpfOrvTur*

202–6 Si . . . decanta] Si praesens vita tibi est fastidiosa et ardentи desiderio ad videndum
omnipotentem et ad supernam patriam accenderis hos psalmos decanta *F*: Si cuilibet vita
praesens fastidio sit (e fastidiat) ei superna contemplari iuvat *Opf* 202 Si tibi] Sibi *D*
tibi . . . et om. *Pa4* tibi] te *AL Orv Tur* : om. *KMN* vita] add. tibi *MN* fastidiosa] fastidiosus *AL* : fastidio *DHU^P* : fastidium *MN* : in fastidio *MazPa3* 203 sit] est *GHDHU*
MazPa3Tur animum tuum] animum *E* : animam tuam *LNOrv* : animus tuus *MazPa3* delectet] delectat *H BENPa4Tur* : om. *GMazPa3* 203–4 supernam] add. cupid *MazPa3* 204 contemplare] contemplari *BIJLDHUMaz* 204–6 et . . . mente om. *MN* *MazPa3OrvTur* 204–5 omnipotentem deum inv. *Pa4* : omnipotenti deo *BEN* 205 deum] dominum *E* : om. *D* ardentи] ardente *Pa2* desiderio] add. et *GH* : add. intueri *DHU Pa4* : add. quaerere *IJ* : add. deprecare *LPa1* 206 intenta] intento *A* : in tota *L* (*prius sed corr.*) : tota *Pa1* : om. *DHU* mente] add. rogare *H* hos . . . decanta] hanc prius orationem cum psalmis sequentibus (et orationem) decantare debes *Maz* : hoc psalmum decanta *Orv* : add. ut clemens deus mentem tuam consoletur *Pa4* psalmos] add. intenta mente *DHU* 207–10 Sicut . . . consolabitur om. *MazPa3OpfOrvTur* (*pss. 41, 62, 83 cum cap. et coll.*) 207 Sicut cervus *AJL* : *Quemadmodum* desiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum *F* : *Q. d. c. GK BENPa1Pa2* : *Q. BDEHIMNDHUPa4* et *AL* : om. *BDEGHFIJKMNNDHUPa1Pa2* Quam amabilia sunt *JL* : Quam dilecta tabernacula tua *FG BENPa2* : *Q. d. ABDEIDHUIPa1* : Deus deus meus ad te de luce vigilo *K* : *D. d. m. a. t. d. l. N* : *D. d. m. a. t. HMPa4* 208–9 Deus . . . vigilo]

202–3 tibi . . . sit: cf. Gregorius, *In Hiez. hom.* 1.10.11, ed. Adriaen, 49 (“ita et eis uita praesens oneri et lux ipsa fastidio fieret”).

203–4 supernam . . . contemplare: cf. Gregorius, *Moralia in Job* 19.16.25, ed. Adriaen, 977 (“orationes . . . per quas supernam patriam ingrediamur, ut Regis nostri gloriam contemplemur”).

207–9 Pss 41 (*Rom.*: Sicut cervus desiderat; *Gall.*: *Quemadmodum* desiderat cervus); 83 (*Rom.*:

210 *gilo; et clemens Deus citius mentem tuam consoletur.*

6. *Si te in tribulationibus a Deo derelictum intellegas, compuncto corde decanta hos psalmos: Usquequo, Domine; Deus, auribus nostris; Miserere mihi, Domine, quoniam conculcavit; Exaudi, Deus, orationem meam et ne despexeris; In te, Domine, speravi; et te Deus statim laetificet in omnibus angustiis tuis.*

cito mente tuam consolatur.

Si te in tribulationibus a Deo derelictum intellegas, compuncto corde hos psalmos decanta: Usquequo, Domine; Deus, auribus; Miserere mei, Deus; Exaudi, Deus, orationem meam et ne despexeris; In te, Domine, speravi I; et te Deus laetificat statim in omnibus angustiis tuis.

Deus deus meus ad te de luce *BF* : D. d. m. *IJ* : Quam dilecta tabernacula tua domine *K* : Q. d. *HMNPa4* 209–10 et . . . consolabitur] et complebitur desiderium tuum *F* : *om. Pa4* 209 clemens] clementissimus *H* citius] cito *DHU* citius . . . tuam] mentem tuam citius *KMN* 210 consoletur *ADL* : consolabitur *BEHMNBENPa1Pa2* : consolatur *GKDHU* : consolatus *IJ*

6. *ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPDHUBEN | MazPa1Pa2Pa3 Pa4Opf*

211 *Si . . . tribulationibus] Si diversis tribulationibus afflictus fueris et Pa4 (cf. supra) te quis se Opf: om. FPa3 tribulationibus] temptationibus F: temptatione *MN* *Maz* : tribulatione tua te sentis Pa3 212 intellegas] intellegis *HMNMaz* : intellegat Opf: te videris : om. Pa3 compuncto corde] compunctus corde F: in primis hanc orationem cum psalmis sequentibus et precibus inferioribus atque oratione subsequenti compuncto corde *Maz* : intenta mente Pa3 : om. Pa2Opf 213 decanta . . . psalmos] hos psalmos decanta *EFHDHUPa4* : decanta *M* : canta hos psalmos *BEN* : decantare oportet *Maz* : decantanda Opf: decanta hunc psalmum cum aliis quattuor sequentibus Pa3 213–19 Usquequo . . . tuis om. *MazPa3Opf* (pss. 12, 30, 43, 54, 55 cum cap. et coll.) 213–14 domine] add. o. m. in finem *FPa2* : add. o. m. *G* : deus *DHU* : deus, Deus deus meus respice *Pa4* (us. 4) : om. *M* 214 nostris] add. audivimus *FGBENPa2* : om. *MPa4* 214–15 Miserere mihi domine *A* (corr.) *DHU^{NB} BEN* : *M. mei deus A(prius) BDEFGHIJKLMNOPDHU^PPa2* : *M. mei D: lacuna Pa1* : Exaudi deus orationem meam et ne despexeris *Pa4* quoniam conculcavit] add. homo *FPa2* : *II E* : miserere mei *GN* : miserere *M: lacuna Pa1* : om. *AII* *DHUBEN(Pa4)* 216–17 Exaudi . . . despexeris] add. deprecationem (meam) *BFBENPa2* : Miserere mei deus quoniam conculcavit *Pa4* : om. *K* 216 meam om. *JDHUPa1* 217 In . . . speravi] add. *II BNPa2* : add. *I EPa1* : add. non confundar (in aeternum) *II FG* : Exaudi orationem meam cum deprecor, Salvum me fac *Pa4* (us. 4) 218 te deus statim] deus statim *FGIJPa4* : deus statim te *DHU* : statim deus cor tuum *H* : statim te deus *MNPa1* : deus te *BEN* laetificet *ALPa1Pa2* : laetificat *EG(prius) HKDHU* : laetificat te *G* (corr.) *IJ* : laetificabit *BDMN* : laetificabit statim *BEN* : laetificabit te *Pa4* : visitabit *F* in omnibus *om. FMNBEN* 219 angustiis tuis] angustias tuas propitius *F* : om. *MN* *BENPa1**

Quam amabilia sunt tabernacula; *Gall*: Quam dilecta tabernacula); 62.

212–17 Ps 12; 43; 55 (Rom: Miserere mihi domine; *Gall*: Miserere mei deus); Ps 54; Ps 30.

220 7. Post autem acceptam quietem ac
prosperitatis tempore, hos psalmos in
laude Dei decanta: *Benedicam Domi-
num in omni tempore; Benedic anima
mea Dominum et omnia; Exaltabo te,
Deus rex meus*; et in omni tempore
sive prosperitatis sive adversitatis
semper hymnum trium puerorum de-
canta. Nullus itaque mortalium virtu-
tem huius hymni explicare potest, in
quo omnis creatura ad laudandum
creatorem invocatur.

Postea, accepto quietis et prospe-
ritatis tempore, hos psalmos decanta:
*Benedicam Dominum; Benedic I; Ex-
altabo te, Deus meus rex*; et in omni
tempore sive prosperitatis sive ad-
versitatis hymnum trium puerorum
decanta. Nullus itaque mortalium vir-
tutem huius hymni explicare potest,
in quo omnis creatura ad laudandum
creatorem invitatur.

7. ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPDHUBEN | MazPa1Pa2Pa3Pa4Opf

220 Post . . . tempore] Accepta autem quiete *F*: Si vis deum omnipotentem laudare *Pa4*
autem acceptam] haec accepta *E*: acceptam *DHU L**MazPa3Opf*: acceptam hanc *H*: acceptam
autem *IJKMN**BEN*: acceptum *Pa1*: autem auditam *Pa2* quietem] quiete *E*: prosperitatem
H 220–31 ac . . . invocatur *om. Opf*(*pss. 33, 144 cum cap. et coll.*) 220 ac et *Pa2*:
om. Pa3 221 prosperitatis tempore *inv. Pa3* prosperitatis] prosperitatem *G*: quietem *H*
tempore] tempora *BDKN**DHU**Pa2*: temporis *GH*: tempus *BEN**Maz* hos psalmos] hos
decanta psalmos *MN*: hanc prius orationem cum psalmis sequentibus *Maz*: *om. F* 221–
22 in . . . decanta] decanta in laude dei *Pa3*: decanta in laudem d. *FH*: decanta in laudem
IJ: decanta *E**BEN**Pa1**Pa4*: *om. MN* 222 laude] laudem *BD* dei *om. G**IJ**DHU* 222–
31 *Benedicam* . . . invocatur *om. Maz*(*pss. 33, 102, 144 cum cap. et coll.*) 222–23 *Bene-
dicam* . . . *meus om. Pa3*(*pss. 33, 102, 144 cum cap. et coll.*) dominum] domino
*BIKLMN**BEN* 223 in omni tempore *om. DEHIJLMN**DHU*^N 224 dominum *A*: domino I
BFMN: domino *DEGIJKL**DHU**BEN**Pa2**Pa4*: *I H**Pa1* et omnia] add. quae *A*: et *IJ*: *om. BEHMN**BEN**Pa1* 225 deus rex meus] domine quoniam suscepisti me (*ps. 29*) *F* rex
meus J: meus rex *BDEGHILN**DHUBEN**Pa2**Pa4*: meus *AMPa1* 225–31 et . . .
invocatur] et istum hymnum trium puerorum sive adversitatis sive prosperitatis omni tempore
decanta *Pa1*: *om. Pa4* 224 in . . . tempore] semper *F* in *om. GHMN**BEN* 225–
26 tempore . . . adversitatis] prosperitatis sive adversitatis tempore *DHU* 226 sive¹ *om. E*
prosperitatis] prosperitates *G*(*prius sed corr.*): prosperitas *Pa3* adversitatis] adversis
DPa2: adversitas *Pa3* 227 semper . . . puerorum] hymnum trium puerorum semper
*H**Pa3*: h. t. p. *E* semper] in omni tempore *F* 227–28 decanta] add. quia
*MN**BEN*: psalle *F*: *om. L* 228 Nullus] Nemo *H* itaque] enim *F*: namque *K*: *om. MN**BEN*
mortalium] mortalis *MN**BEN* 228–29 virtutem *om. Pa3* 229 potest] potes
AN: add. misteria *Pa3* 230 laudandum] laudem *B* 231 creatorem] creatore *B*: deum
F invocatur] vocantur *D*: vocatur *E*: invitatur *FG**DHU*: invocator *IJ*

222–25 *Pss 33; Ps 102* (see use 3 above); *144* (*Rom.*: *Exaltabo te deus rex meus*; *Gall.*: *Exal-
tabo te deus meus rex*). For the variant in *Ps 33*, cf. the feria ii responsory “*Benedicam domino
(al. dominum) in omni tempore*” in Roman and Benedictine Office books (Raymond Le Roux,
“*Étude de l’office dominical et férial. Les répons ‘de psalmis’ pour les matines de l’Epiphanie à
la Septuagesime*,” *Études grégoriennes* 5 [1963]: 69).

8. Si volueris intima mente exercere te in divinis laudibus ac praecepsis et mandatis caelestibus, psalmum
 235 *Beati immaculati* decanta; et licet ad obitum vitae huius psalmi virtutem contempleris atque scruteris, numquam perfecte illum, ut puto, intellegere potes, in quo nullus versus
 240 est in quo non sit vel via Dei, vel lex vel mandatum seu praeceptum Dei, vel verba aut iustificationes, vel iudicia aut sermones Dei descripta. Et ideo non est tibi opus ut per diversos
 245 libros animo diffunderis.

Si volueris intima mente exercere te in divinis laudibus ac praecepsis et mandatis caelestibus, psalmum decanta: *Beati immaculati*; et licet ad obitum vitae huius hymni virtutem contempleris et scruteris, tamen, ut puto, numquam perfecte illum intellegere poteris. In quo nullus versus est, in quo non sit vel via Dei vel lex vel mandatum vel praeceptum Dei aut verba vel iustificationes Dei vel sermones ac iudicia Dei descripta, et non est tibi opus ut per diversos libros animo diffundaris.

8. ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPDHUBEN | MazPal Pa2 Pa4

232–34 Si . . . psalmum] Si in mandatis et in divinis laudibus exercere cupis *F* 232 Si]
add. te LMazPal Pa4 volueris *om. H* intima menta] toto corde *MN* : in toto corde
BEN : intimo corde *Pa4* : *om. Pa1* 232–33 exercere te] exercere *DGLMazPal Pa4* : te vis
 exercere *H* : te exercere *MN BEN* 233–34 ac . . . caelestibus *om. HMN BEN* 234 caelestibus] *add. et A* psalmum] psalmum decanta *E* : hunc psalmum decanta *GDHU* : psalmum
 decanta cuius initium est *Pa1* : psalmum istum decanta *Pa4* : *om. L(prius sed corr.) MN*
 235 *Beati immaculati* *om. L(prius sed corr.)* decanta] frequenta *F* : *om. EGLNDHUPa1Pa4*
 235–45 et . . . diffunderis *om. Pa4* 235–39 et . . . potes *om. MN BEN* 235 licet] *add.*
usque BEFIJMazPal : *add. si usque H* : *liceat Pa2(prius sed corr.)* 236 obitum] finem
 vitae *F* vitae . . . psalmi] huius vitae psalmi huius *H* tuae] suae *J* : *om. F* psalmi]
ymni EF 237 contempleris] contemplaveris *A* : contemplaveris *HLPa1* : contemplatus
 fueris *Maz* : *om. F* atque] ac *DHU* : *om. F* scruteris] perscrutaveris *H* : scrutaveris *Pa1*
 238–39 numquam . . . intellegere] perfecte intellegere non *F* 238 perfecte illum *om. H*
ut puto] utpote *Pa1* 239 potes *AGHIJKLMH* : poteris *BDEFMazPa2* quo] eo quidem
F nullus] *add. pene MN* 239–40 versus est *inv. DFK* 240 in quo] ubi
GMNDHUBEN sit] fit *A* : *sint MazPa2* : legitur *F* dei] domini *E* : *om. F* 241 man-
 datum] mandata *DHU* seu praeceptum] sive praecpta *MN BEN* dei] domini *HMN* : *om. F*
 242 vel verbal] vel iudicia *H* : *add. dei K* : *add. domini M* : *om. N* aut] vel *F*
 242 iustificationes] *add. dei E* : verba *H* 242–43 iudicia] sermones dei *E* : sermones *F*;
iustificationes H 243 sermones] iudicia *E* : iusticia *F* dei] domini *F* : *om. IJDHU^P*
descripta ABDEFJKLMH : *descripti GHMN* *MazPa1* : *descripta IJ* 243–45 Et . . .
diffunderis om. MN BEN 244 est . . . opus] opus est tibi *Pa1* tibi *om. F* 245 animo]
animum GJDHU diffunderis] diffundaris *EFHKMaz* : diffundas *GJDHU* *Pa1*

235 Ps 118.

240–43 via . . . iudicia: cf. Ps.-Hieronymus, *Breviarium in psalmos*, Ps 118 praef., PL 26:1187 [1258 alt. ed] (“continentur in eo lex, mandata, iustificationes, testimonia, iudicia ac viae”); Alcuinus, *Expositio in Ps 118*, praef., PL 101:597.

244–45 (col. b) et . . . diffundaris: Ludolphus, *In psalmos*, prol. (exc. 244, et ideo non).

In psalterio solo usque ad obitum
vitae habes materiam legendi, scrutandi,
docendi, in quo invenies prophetas, evangelia atque apostolicos et
omnes divinos libros spiritualiter atque intellegibiliter ex parte tractatos
atque descriptos; et priorem atque secundum adventum Domini ibi reperies prophetatos, incarnationem
250 quoque ac passionem resurrectionemque atque ascensionem dominicam et omnem virtutem divinorum dictorum in psalmis invenies, si intima mente perscruteris et ad medullam intimi intellectus per Dei gratiam perveneris.

In psalterio enim solo usque ad obitum habes materiam legendi, scrutandi, discendi, et docendi. In quo invenies prophetias, evangelia, apostolicos omnesque divinos libros spiritualiter atque intellegibiliter tractatos ac descriptos et priorem atque secundum adventum Domini.

ABCDEFGHIJKLMH | MazPa1Pa2

246–51 In . . . intellegibilit] lacuna C 246 In] quia in Pa1 psalterio] add. enim BDEFPa2 : add. vero H solo] add. habes Maz 247 vitae] add. tuae IJH habes om. Maz 248–49 prophetas] propheticos IJ 249 evangelia] evangelicos DJ : evangelium K atque om. FHPa1 apostolicos ABDEIJKLMH Maz : apostolos FGHPa1Pa2 249–50 et omnes] omnesque EF 250–51 spiritualiter atque] spiritualiterque GHDHU 251 intellegibiliter BDEFMazPa1Pa2 : intellegitur AGHIJL(prius) : intellectualiter L(al. man.) : intelligenter K tractatos] tractos AG(prius sed corr.) L(prius sed corr.) DHU 252 atque] ac B descriptos] scriptos C(prius sed corr.) 252–61 et . . . perveneris om. F 252 et om. E 253 adventum domini inv. E domini] add. nostri ihesu christi H ibi] ubi G(prius sed corr.) 253–54 reperies] reperias Pa1 : invenies EPa2 254 prophetatos] prophetatum EL(al. man.) Pa1 255–56 resurrectionemque] add. dominicam E : resurrectionem DHKPa1 256–57 dominicam] domini (del.) dominicam G : om. E 257 omnem virtutem] omnes virtutes K 258 dictorum] misteriorum E : doctorum Pa2 in om. C(prius sed corr.) si] et si Pa1 : om. A 258–59 intimi] intimo AK : tota Pa1 259 perscruteris] perscrutaveris HPa1 et om. Pa1 259–60 medullam] medelam Maz : om. Pa1 260 intimi] intimum Pa1 : add. mente Maz intellectus] intellectum Pa1 261 perveneris] pervenies DHU Pa2 : add. Omnes etenim virtutes in psalmis invenies si a deo merueris ut tibi revelet secreta psalmorum Maz(ut supra, 137–40)

(col. b) 249–50 apostolicos] apostolos MS

256–53 (col. b) In . . . Domini: cf. Ludolphus, *In psalmos*, prol. (=col. a, 246–61, exc. 247–48, scrutandi et docendi; 248–49, propheticos euangelicos atque apostolicos; 250–51, ac intelligibiliter; ex parte tactos; 253–54 om. reperies; 256–57, domini; 258, om. dictorum).

MEDIEVAL LATIN POETIC ANTHOLOGIES (VII): THE BIBLICAL ANTHOLOGY FROM YORK MINSTER LIBRARY (MS. XVI Q 14)*

Greti Dinkova-Bruun

IN 1977, A. G. Rigg inaugurated his series “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies” in the pages of this journal. By 1987 four subsequent articles had appeared, the last in collaboration with David Townsend, and the series was continued in 1990 by Peter Binkley.¹ Rigg’s principal interest was in the “Goliardic” anthologies;² Townsend and Binkley focused primarily on the poetic production of Henry of Avranches. The results of this work were put into context in Rigg’s history of Anglo-Latin literature published in 1992.³

The aim of this article is to expand our understanding of the compositional affinities and textual similarities between the various anthologies. Unlike the previous contributions in the series, it will not only describe the contents of an anthology but will also present an edition of the entire text with a view to helping the recognition of similar poems in other collections and providing a basis for future comparative study.

The anthology described and edited below is found in York Minster Library, Ms. XVI Q 14, fols. 51v–55v (henceforth *Y*). This early thirteenth-century English manuscript contains a large collection of the best examples of medieval Christian poetry. The texts in the manuscript are carefully selected.

* I am grateful to A. G. Rigg, Jennifer A. Harris, and Fred Unwalla for their comments on the earlier drafts of this article.

¹ A. G. Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies” (I–IV), *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977): 281–330, 40 (1978): 387–406, 41 (1979): 468–505, and 43 (1981): 472–97; D. Townsend and A. G. Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (V): Matthew Paris’ Anthology of Henry of Avranches (Cambridge, University Library, Ms. Dd.11.78),” *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987): 352–90; P. Binkley, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (VI): The Cotton Anthology of Henry of Avranches (B.L. Cotton Vespasian D.V, fols. 151–184),” *Mediaeval Studies* 52 (1990): 221–54.

² See “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies” (I–III). “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies” (IV) has a different character. It focuses on the large anthology from Oxford, Bodleian Library Rawlinson G. 109, in which there is no “Goliardic” poetry, and its comparison to fourteen other anthologies.

³ A. G. Rigg, *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature 1066–1422* (Cambridge, 1992), 148–55, 236–38, 307–9, and 311–12.

Even though the anthology contains 103 individual poems, it reveals a strong unity of design and has the character of a single poetic composition that has its own defined place and meaning in the creation of the large verse collection in which it is included. This notion, together with some of the characteristics of the anthology, will be explored in more detail later.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT AND ITS CONTENTS⁴

Description

Parchment: 310–17 × 224–28 mm. Hair side out. HFFH in sequence.

Foliation: iii + 115 + iii. All six flyleaves are of paper. Foliated (i–iii), 1–115, (i–iii), with a late medieval foliation halfway down the outer margin of each recto on fols. 2–115: 1–39, 41–89, 100–125, the first gap indicating the loss of one leaf after fol. 40, the second an error. Fol. 1 must have been pasted down when the medieval foliation was added, which explains why it starts with fol. 2. Nevertheless fol. 1 is part of the first quire.

Collation: 1⁶⁺¹ 2⁸⁺¹ 3–4⁸ 5¹⁰ (wants 9 after fol. 40) 6¹⁰ 7⁵ (fols. 52–56) 8⁸ 9¹⁰ 10⁶⁺² (fols. 81–82 are added) 11–12⁸ 13⁸ (wants 8) + 14¹² (wants 11–12).

Page layout: Written space, ruling and pricking vary for each work. For the anthology the written space is 246 × 185 mm. Text in two columns, 53 lines each, top line above ruling. Pricking for the horizontals in both margins. Each line is marked by a *littera notabilior* in alternating blue and red for the paragraphs. Titles in red precede some of the poems or are added in the margins.

Script and punctuation: Nearly the whole manuscript is written in one small hand, English Caroline Minuscule verging on Gothic, 1.5–2 mm. high, early thirteenth century. The punctuation consists of *punctus* and *punctus elevatus*.

Binding: Rebound in April 1820.

Contents

- 1r–v. Petrus Pictuiensis, *Genealogia Christi*. Only one leaf, with fourteen roundels on the main stem from Ozias (=Azarias) to Abiud. On fol. 1v a circular diagram shows the six gates of the Temple.⁵

⁴ A summary description is in A. Piper, *York Minster Medieval Manuscripts*, a typescript copy presented to the library in 1989, pp. 222–37. I am grateful to Dr. Shelagh Sneddon for confirming some unclear points about the manuscript.

⁵ See P. S. Moore, *The Works of Peter of Poitiers* (Indiana, 1936), 97–117; and S. Panayotova, “Peter of Poitiers’s *Compendium in Genealogia Christi*: The Early English Copies,” in *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. R. Gameson and H. Leyser (Oxford, 2001), 327–41.

- 2) 2r–18r. Laurentius Dunelmensis, *Hypognosticon*, preceded by the prose prologue to the poem and tables of numbered chapters to each book.⁶
- 3) 18r–30v. Arator, *De Actibus Apostolorum*.⁷ The poem is followed by two short texts. The first is a passage in prose, *inc.* “Beato domino Petro adiuuante . . .” and *expl.* “. . . Basilio uiro clarissimo inductione septima.”⁸ The second text is a poem of nine hexameters entitled “Versibus egregiis decursum clarus Arator.”⁹ The two pieces are presumably by the same author.
- 4) 31r–v. Sedulius, *Epistola ad Macedonium presbiterum*.¹⁰ The letter is preceded by a short biographical note on the poet entitled “Quis fuit Sedulius?” (on fol. 30v).¹¹
- 5) 31v. Turcius Rufus Asterius, *Carmen*.¹²
- 6) 31v. Proba, *Cento* (only the dedication to Arcadius, fifteen verses).¹³
- 7) 32r–40v. Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* (ending with 5.275).¹⁴ Occasional interlinear glosses. A folio is missing after fol. 40. The concluding lines of *Carmen Paschale* and the beginning verses of the following *Hymnus I* were presumably copied on this missing folio.
- 8) 41r–v. Sedulius, *Hymnus I*, beginning imperfectly with verse 15: “Sume, pater, populos pro nati uulnere cunctos.”¹⁵

⁶ M. L. Mistretta, *The “Hypognosticon” of Lawrence of Durham: A Preliminary Text with Introduction* (Ph.D. diss., Fordham University, 1941).

⁷ Arator, *De Actibus Apostolorum*, ed. A. P. McKinlay, CSEL 72 (Vienna, 1951).

⁸ See *ibid.*, xxviii, where the text is slightly longer and bears the title “Praefatio cuiusdam de libro Aratoris.” McKinlay edits it from Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Pal. lat. 1716 (s. x), fol. 1r.

⁹ See *ibid.*, xxix, where the text is edited from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 1941 (s. x–xi), 154. It is worth noting that the final three verses in *Y* differ from the text printed by McKinlay. The verses in *Y* are as follows:

Scriptori maneat pia pax et uita perhennis;
Nobis solamen peccatorumque leuamen
Sit Pater et flamen et filius unicus. Amen.

¹⁰ Sedulius, *Opera Omnia*, ed. J. Hümer, CSEL 10 (Vienna, 1885), 1–13.

¹¹ The note reads “Iste Sedulius primo laicus fuit in seculari sapientia deditus. Postea ad Dominum conuersus scripsit hunc librum quasi per dirocheum, id est duplicum refectionem, de ueteri et nouo testamento. Prius uero prosaice fecit, postea metrice composuit et pretitulauit carmine pascali consecrans Macedonio presbitero. Mos enim erat apud antiquos, ut sua scripta sapientibus et nobilibus conferrent, ut eorum auctoritate roborarentur et ab emulis saluarentur. Docuit autem partim in Asia, partim in Italia.”

¹² Sedulius, *Opera Omnia*, ed. Hümer, *Appendix I: Carmina ad Sedulium spectantia*, 307.

¹³ *Cento Vergilianus*, ed. K. Schenkl, in *Poetae Christiani Minores*, CSEL 16/1 (Vienna, 1888), 569–609. See also E. A. Clark and D. F. Hatch, *The Golden Bough, the Oaken Cross: The Virgilian Cento of Faltonia Betitia Proba* (Ann Arbor, 1981).

¹⁴ Sedulius, *Opera Omnia*, ed. Hümer, 14–146.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 155–62.

- 9) 41v. Sedulius, *Hymnus II, inc.* “A solis ortus cardine.”¹⁶
- 10) 41v–42v. Prudentius, *Tituli historiarum quod Dirochaeum de utroque testamento uocatur*,¹⁷ preceded by *Sententia de libro Gennadii De uiris illustribus*.¹⁸
- 11) 43r–48v. Prudentius, *Psicomachia, id est, uirtutum uiciorumque pugna*.¹⁹ Frequent interlinear glosses.
- 12) 48v–49r. Beda Venerabilis, *Meditatio de die iudicii*.²⁰ The last two verses of the poem are missing. Glosses on the initial fifty verses.
- 13) 49v–51v. Hildebertus Cenomanensis, *Versus de ueteri et nouo testamento*.²¹
- 14) 51v–55v. Anthology of biblical verse. See the discussion of this anthology, pp. 66–76, and the edited text, pp. 76–106 below.
- 15) 55v–58v. Magister Alexander prior de Essebi, *Breuissima comprehensio historiarum*.²² Original short version.
- 16) 58v–59v. Methodius Episcopus, *Liber Methodii martiri*.²³
- 17) 59v–61v. Ricardus de Sancto Victore, *De thabernaculo federis et eius pertinentiis*.²⁴

¹⁶ Ibid., 163–68.

¹⁷ Prudentius, *Carmina*, ed. M. P. Cunningham, CCL 126 (Turnhout, 1966), 390–400.

¹⁸ See A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* (Hamburg, 1718), *Liber Gennadii de uiris illustribus* 13, pp. 10–11.

¹⁹ Prudentius, *Carmina*, ed. Cunningham, 149–81.

²⁰ Beda Venerabilis, *Opera Rhythmica*, ed. J. Fraipont, CCL 122 (Turnhout, 1955), 439–44.

²¹ See A. B. Scott, Deirdre F. Baker, A. G. Rigg, “The Biblical Epigrams of Hildebert of Le Mans: A Critical Edition,” *Mediaeval Studies* 47 (1985): 272–316. Even though the order of the epigrams in *Y* is quite different from the one adopted in this edition of Hildebert, the selection of poems remains similar. Only six epigrams (nos. 27, 61, 63, 65, 67–69) are missing in *Y*. Instead, *Y* includes four other short poems, of which two are found among the works of Hildebert (see H. Walther, *Initia Carminum ac Versuum Medii Aevi Posterioris Latinorum* (Göttingen, 1959; 2d ed., 1969), nos. 2202 and 20336, printed in PL 171:1281D, no. 6, and 1277D, no. 15) and two are unattested elsewhere: “Sponte cadas, pax est, bellum si mente resistis / Pax et iusticia iunguntur carne subacta” (fol. 50v) and “Aluus de celo, precepe recepit ab aluo, / Crux de presepi, de cruce tumba Deum” (fol. 51v). The same couplet is repeated in the anthology (see below, no. 101). It is interesting that a poem that is not attested in any other source is found twice in *Y*.

²² See G. Dinkova-Bruun, “Alexander of Ashby’s *Breuissima comprehensio historiarum*: A Critical Edition with Annotation” (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1999). For the edition of both the *Breuissima comprehensio historiarum* and Alexander’s other poem, the *Liber Festivalis*, see G. Dinkova-Bruun, “*Opera Poetica of Alexander of Ashby*” forthcoming in the *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis*.

²³ See F. Stegmüller and N. Reinhardt, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, 11 vols. (Madrid 1950–80) (henceforth Stegmüller, *Repertorium*), no. 5586. The title of the work in Stegmüller is *De principio saeculi*.

²⁴ Ricardus de S. Victore, *Nonnullae allegoriae tabernaculi foederis*, PL 196:191C–202B.

18) 61v–64r. Petrus Pictor, *Liber de sacramentis*.²⁵

19) 64r. Petrus Pictor, *Carmen de uera essencia Dei* and *Carmen de catholica fide*.²⁶

20) 64r–v. Venantius Fortunatus, *De uirginitate* (lines 1–263).²⁷

21) 65r–69v. Laurentius Dunelmensis, *Consolatio de morte amici*.²⁸

22) 69v–80r. Laurentius Dunelmensis, *Dialogi*.²⁹

23) 80r–82v. Matheus Vindocinensis, *Ars uersificatoria* (extracts).³⁰

a) 80r: Orbis ad exemplum pape procedit honestas (no. 50, pp. 64–67)

b) 80r–v: Militat in bello constancia cesaris obstat (no. 51, pp. 67–70)

c) 80v: Purpurat eloquium, sensus festiuat Vlixem (no. 52, pp. 70–73)

d) 80v–81r: Scurra uagus, parasitus edax, abiectio plebis (no. 53, pp. 73–78)

e) 81r–v: Marcia preradiat uirtutem dote redundat (no. 55, pp. 80–82)

f) 81v: Cartula presumit simplex que uenit ad artes (no. 54, pp. 79–80)

g) 81v:

1. Pauperat artificis nature dona uenustas (no. 56, pp. 82–84)
2. Respondent ebori dentes, frons libera lacti (no. 57, vv. 1–4, 9–18, pp. 84–85)

h) 81v–82r: Est Beroe rerum scabies fex lurida, uultu (no. 58, pp. 86–88)

i) 82r: Ver roseum tenero lacuuit flore, laborat (no. 107, p. 113)

j) 82r:

1. Ver florum genitor, estas nutricula fructus (no. 108, p. 114)
2. Sunt partes anni bis bine: uer tepet, estas (no. 108, p. 114)
3. Lucifer astra fugat, solis precursor, ad ortum (no. 108, p. 114)

k) 82r–v: Nature studium locus est quo ueris habundat (no. 111, p. 116–26).

24) 83r–105v: Alanus de Insulis, *Anticlaudianus*.³¹

²⁵ Petrus Pictor, *Carmina*, ed. L. van Acker, CCCM 25 (Turnhout, 1972), 11–45. In the York manuscript the poem is attributed to Petrus Abelardus and given the title *De sacramento altaris*.

²⁶ Petrus Pictor, *Carmina*, ed. van Acker, 69–70 and 73–74.

²⁷ Venantius Fortunatus, *Carminum Liber Octauus, Carmen III: De uirginitate*, ed. F. Leo, MGH Auct. Ant. 4/1 (Berlin, 1881), 181–91. The whole poem is 400 verses long.

²⁸ Laurentius von Durham: *Consolatio de morte amici. Untersuchungen und kritischer Text*, ed. U. Kindermann (Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1969).

²⁹ *Dialogi Laurentii Dunelmensis monachi ac prioris*, ed. J. Raine, Publications of the Surtees Society 70 (Durham, 1880).

³⁰ *Mathei Vindocinensis Opera*, ed. F. Munari, vol 3: *Ars versificatoria*, Storia e letteratura 171 (Rome, 1988).

³¹ Alain de Lille: *Anticlaudianus*, ed. R. Bossuat (Paris, 1955).

25) 105v: Six anonymous short pieces of verse, in several hands, s. XIII in.:

- Rectum redde ratum; reproba, Ricarde, reatum (eight verses)³²
- Flosculus in uolucrum mostrat tibi quinque uolucrum (three verses)
- Per claustral is aue paret illi transitus a ue (six verses)
- Virginis ingenite de uirgine pro lis honorem (six verses, see Walther, *Initia*, no. 20469)
- Lingua nocet que falsa docet uel fallere temptat (ten verses)
- Flecte caput, fili, quia dicunt gloria patri (five verses, see Walther, *Initia*, no. 6602)

26) 106r: Petrus Riga, *Susanna* (only the final seven verses).

- Quod negat ille, negat ille; quod iste docet / Nil restat nisi crux, sua pena redundet in illos.³³
- Vapulet et virgis doctor uterque suis (three verses)³⁴
- Dixerat et celeri mors debita dampnat iniquos / Dampnat et indempnis redditur illa uiro.³⁵

27) 106r–111v. Galfridus de Vinosalvo, *Poetria Noua*,³⁶ ending imperfectly with verse 2080, fifteen lines into the epilogue.

28) 112r–115v. Galfridus Monumetensis, *Vita Merlini*,³⁷ ending imperfectly with verse 1387.

DISCUSSION OF THE ANTHOLOGY

The anthology in York (no. 14 in the preceding list of contents) consists entirely of verses on biblical themes, a characteristic that sets it apart from the other Latin poetic anthologies, which typically combine poems on a larger variety of topics. The different poetic compositions in the collection are clearly organized thematically. First, there is a division between Old Testament and New Testament themes; and second, the pieces in the New Testament section follow sequentially the important events in the life of Christ.

³² The initial letters of the verses form the acrostic RICARDVS. Additionally, all words in a single verse begin with the same letter.

³³ The couplet is printed in J. H. Mozley, “Susanna and the Elders: Three Medieval Poems,” *Studi Medievali*, n.s., 3 (1930): 27–52, esp. 41 (note to line 193 in the *apparatus criticus* to the poem).

³⁴ See Mozley, “Susanna and the Elders,” 41, vv. 198–200; and *Aurora: Petri Rigae Biblia Versificata*, ed. P. E. Beichner, 2 vols. (Indiana, 1965), 1:367, vv. 644–46.

³⁵ These two verses are not found in either Mozley’s or Beichner’s edition of the poem.

³⁶ E. Faral, *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1924), III. Geoffroi de Vinsauf, *Poetria Noua*, 194–262. The text printed by Faral is 2116 verses long.

³⁷ *Geoffrey of Monmouth: Life of Merlin*, ed. and trans. B. Clarke (Cardiff, 1973). The entire poem is 1529 verses long.

The sections devoted to the Old and the New Testament are uneven in length, fourteen and eighty-nine poems respectively. They are arranged as follows:

Old Testament

- 1 God as creative force and substance
- 2–3 The six days of creation and the creation of Eve
- 4–5 Noah
- 6–9 Sacrifice to God - Melchisedech, Abraham, Paschal Lamb, circumcision
- 10–13 *De decem plagis et decem preceptis*
- 14 *De Daniele*

New Testament

- 15 The four evangelists
- 16–19 Christological significance of the evangelist symbols
- 20–21 *De tribus Mariis*
- 22–23 The Virgin Mary
- 24 Annunciation
- 25–31 Incarnation and Birth of Christ
- 32–35 *De tribus regibus*
- 36 *De oblatione Domini*
- 37–58 Life of Christ - his miracles, apostles, teachings about poverty and mercy
- 59–60 *De cena Domini*
- 61–98 Crucifixion and death of Christ
- 99 Resurrection
- 100–13 A summary of the life and death of Christ

The poems in the Old Testament section do not seem to show unity of design. In fact, they are too few to present a sustained, coherent structure. The section begins with a distich on God's creative power and poems on the six days of creation and the flood. This conventional beginning to the retelling of biblical history is soon frustrated, however, by what follows: an explanation of the meaning of the sacrifice to God drawing on the figurative parallels between Melchisedech, Abraham, and Christ; an enumeration of the ten plagues; a catalogue of the decalogue; and a closing distich on Balthasar's feast, Daniel, and God's approaching judgement. The thematic variety of the section reveals its miscellaneous character. However, what seems miscellaneous may only be the result of an incomplete text. The gap in the manuscript between the Old and the New Testament sections at fol. 52v, where the remaining space could accommodate forty-six verses, as well as the difference in length between the two sections would appear to support this claim. But whether the

Old Testament part is complete or not, its relationship with the New Testament part remains difficult to define.

Unlike the Old Testament section, the one devoted to the New Testament is skillfully constructed and carefully planned. Here the creator of the anthology reveals himself as a skillful compiler. Although he is not an original storyteller (it is, after all, the story of Christ), his selection of biblical verse and his arrangement of the available material create a poetic collection with a personal voice. The reader of the anthology in *Y* is drawn into the spiritual exercise of following in Christ's footsteps and internalizing the importance of Christ's sacrifice.

The New Testament section begins with nine introductory poems on the four evangelists and the genealogy of Mary (nos. 15–23). An epilogue of four poems (nos. 101–3) summarizes the entire life of Christ, while the remaining poems not only present the major events in his life, but also explain their universal meaning.

Poems 24–36 describe Christ's early years and are devoted to the Annunciation, Nativity (which is given special emphasis over some seven poems), Epiphany, and the Presentation in the Temple. This section contains only thirteen poems, although some of them are rather long. For example, no. 24 is forty-three lines, no. 27 is sixty-two lines, no. 28 is forty-two lines, and no. 29 is twenty-two lines. This characteristic is not typical of the poems in the second and the third parts, in which the poems increase in number and decrease in length.

Explanations of the names of the apostles, some of Christ's miracles and his moral doctrine are the subject of poems 37–58 which form the second part of the New Testament section. Within the group, the inclusion of the poem *De decollatione Iohannis Baptiste* (no. 47) is especially puzzling. The only poem in honour of a saint, it is also the longest. When we consider that its 232 verses represent over half the total number of verses in the New Testament section (452 verses), this disproportionately long piece on the decapitation of John the Baptist seems even more anomalous. The destinies of John the Baptist and Christ are closely connected from even before their birth, but what bearing does the beheading of John the Baptist have on Christ's own life? We could hazard an explanation by observing that the poem follows the general outline of the biblical account in Matthew 14:1–12 and Mark 6:14–29. When John dies, Jesus tries to escape to a solitary place but is followed by a big crowd of people. In front of this gathering Jesus performs a series of miracles that prove to be instrumental in the spreading of the Christian faith. This shows that the decapitation of John the Baptist had a significant impact on Christ's life and thus deserved to be included in our anthology. Nevertheless,

a satisfactory explanation of the disproportionate length of the poem remains elusive. After all, any explanation would have to take into account several other features of the poem. For example, the biblical story is interrupted twice by excursus on the evil nature of women (verses 145–64 and 180–84). In fact these additions call attention to themselves through a change of meter, as the poem, which is written in leonine hexameters, changes to *hexametri tripertiti* at verses 145 and 180 to create a rhetorically elaborate address to the reader. The poem ends with a complaint about the unfortunate effects of love on man's moral nature, a declaration that the just will be crowned on judgement day, and a prayer to John the Baptist to protect all sinners (verses 208–32).

The third part in the New Testament section, comprising poems 59–103, constitute the most homogeneous part in the anthology. It is also the most original: the majority of the poems included here are not attested elsewhere. Dedicated to the death and resurrection of Christ, it reflects the central idea of redemption and hope of salvation through Christ. In this final part of the anthology we find predominantly short poetic compositions (two or four lines long), very much in the tradition of the biblical verse *tituli*, epigrams, or proverbs.³⁸ The only longer piece (ten verses) is the previously unknown “Anteus noster proprio lapsu releuatur” (no. 99). The layout of the this section of the manuscript helps define these short pieces as distinct poems: all new entries are introduced by larger initials in alternating red and blue;³⁹ some poems are additionally separated from each other by a blank line (nos. 98, 99, and 100); some others are introduced by title headings (no. 59) or marked with lightning-shaped brackets that are unquestionable indicators of the piece's length (nos. 69, 76, 77, 80, 88, 92, 93, etc.).⁴⁰ Finally, in addition to these practical aids found in the York manuscript itself, corroborative evidence in defining the poems is provided by other witnesses that contain them (nos. 59, 61, 69, 91, 93, 94, 98, and 102).

All the poems in the collection are written in hexameters or elegiac cou-

³⁸ For an overview of the genre and its early development, see F. Stella, *La poesia carolingia latina a tema biblico* (Spoleto, 1993), 29–113. The best known later examples of the genre are *Pictor in carmine*, ed. Deirdre F. Baker (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1990), and Hildebert's *Biblical Epigrams*.

³⁹ Poems 50 and 51 constitute an exception. Even though the manuscript presents them as a single poem, I have decided to separate them on the basis of meter: no. 50 is in rhymed hexameters, whereas no. 51 is in rhymed pentameters. At the same time, in no. 40, I have not separated the couplet at vv. 9–10 on metrical grounds, because thematically it is part of a larger unit on the twelve apostles. Either of these decisions could be challenged with the discovery of new information from other witnesses.

⁴⁰ In other parts of the collection meter and rhyme patterns have also proved useful in determining the length of the individual epigrams.

plets, both rhymed and unrhymed, with rhymed verses being predominant. This feature shows *Y* to be a representative of “Hilderbertian” type of anthologies.⁴¹ The influence of Hildebert, especially of his biblical epigrams, could be detected not only in the choice of meter, but also in the rationale for the creation of the entire collection. This explains why the anthology is copied immediately after Hildebert’s epigrams in the York manuscript. At the same time, it precedes Alexander of Ashby’s versification of the historical books of the Bible. The concise style of Alexander’s narrative is very similar to the style of the epigrams. Hildebert’s epigrams, the anonymous anthology, and Alexander of Ashby’s *Breuissima comprehensio historiarum* were all probably copied in close proximity to each other because of their generic similarity and poetic affinity of expression.

The York anthology contains both well-known pieces of medieval poetry, such as “Melchisedech Domino panem uinumque litauit” (no. 6), “Prima rubens unda, rane tabesque secunda” (no. 10), “Disce Deum colere nomenque Dei reuerere” (no. 12), “Anna tribus Ioachim, Cleophe Salomeque Marias” (no. 20), “Ex Ioachim, Cleopha, Saloma tres Anna Marias” (no. 21), “Nectareum rorem terris instillat Olimpus” (no. 27), “Sol, cristallus, aqua dant qualemcumque figuram” (no. 29), and “Rex sedet in cena, turba cinctus duodenā” (no. 59), as well as completely unknown poetic compositions. It is worth noting that the well-known pieces are concentrated at the beginning of the anthology. The more we read, the more original the compilation becomes, and the long famous poems are replaced by previously unrecorded epigrams. The reader has the impression that the anthology begins with songs celebrating universally celebrating the birth of Christ and ends privately lamenting his death.

Many of the poems in *Y* are works of anonymous versifiers, while others are written by some of the major medieval poets like Sedulius (no. 15), Hildebert (nos. 10, 26, 31, 33, 93, and 94), Marbod (no. 24), Ps.-Hugh Primas (no. 38), Serlo of Wilton (no. 42), Petrus Riga (nos. 17, 27, and 29) and Petrus Pictor (no. 98). Six epigrams (nos. 1, 14, 19, 35, 41, and 57) are found in William de Montibus’s *Versarius*, but in this case it is difficult to establish whether William wrote them himself or simply borrowed them from already existing collections.⁴² Finally, two couplets (nos. 64 and 96) are excerpted from Geoffrey of Vinsauf’s *Poetria Nova*. The popularity of two anonymous poems, nos. 6 and 10, is attested by both the large number of manuscripts that pre-

⁴¹ The term was coined by Rigg, *History of Anglo-Latin Literature*, 149–50.

⁴² J. Goering, *William de Montibus (c. 1140–1213): The Schools and the Literature of Pastoral Care*, Studies and Texts 108 (Toronto, 1992), 392–93.

serve them and the fact that they are quoted repeatedly in various medieval works.⁴³

The idea of telling the story of Christ's life in a sequence of short epigrams is not unique to the anthology in York. Petrus Riga uses the device, even though on a much smaller scale, in his *Floridus Aspectus*.⁴⁴ In this collection we find as nos. 9–18 the following ten poems:⁴⁵ *De partu uirgineo*, *De natali Christi*, *De baptismo Christi*, *De oblatione Christi*, *De passione Christi*, *De resurrectione Christi*, *De ascensione Domini*, *De aduentu spiritus sancti*, *De iudicio Christi*, *De Christo Domino* (also called *De omnibus gradibus Christi*). These ten poems are altogether only twenty-six verses long, but they represent in chronological order the most important events in the life of the Redeemer.⁴⁶ In the Middle Ages the poems were apparently considered a self-contained unit and were sometimes copied as an individual composition outside the context of the *Floridus Aspectus*.⁴⁷ It is possible that Riga's very popular collection inspired the compiler of *Y* to create his own collection of biblical verse. Even though his identity remains unknown, some of his working methods become apparent. He collates different sources, judging from two cases (nos. 32 and 82) where he proposes alternative lines for the concluding verses of the poems. He also excerpts from larger poetic compositions like Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale* (no. 15), Serlo of Wilton's *Exhortacio bona ad religiosos* (no. 42), Petrus Pictor's *Liber de sacramentis* (no. 98), Petrus Riga's *Floridus Aspectus* (no. 17), and Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria Nova* (nos. 64 and 96).⁴⁸ Whether he himself is the author of any of the poems is difficult to establish, but it is conceivable that he was both a compiler and a

⁴³ See below, nos. 6 and 10. Poem no. 6 is found in at least sixty manuscripts and poem no. 10 in at least eighty.

⁴⁴ Riga's collection was printed originally among Hildebert's works in PL 171:1381A–1412B; since then Riga's authorship has been established definitively. See A. Boutemy, "Recherches sur *Floridus Aspectus* de Pierre la Rigge," *Le moyen âge* 54 (1948): 89–112, "Recherches sur le *Floridus Aspectus* II," *Latomus* 8 (1949): 159–68, and "Recherches sur le *Floridus Aspectus* III," *Latomus* 8 (1949): 283–301.

⁴⁵ See PL 171:1390C–1391A. The same poems constitute number 3 in Boutemy's "Le *Floridus Aspectus* II," 159–60.

⁴⁶ The order of the poems is sometimes confused. For example, in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 8098, fols. 227r–228v, we have *De partu beate uirginis*, *Oblatio*, *Baptismus*, *Passio*, <*Resurrectio*>, *Item de partu beate uirginis*, *Ascensio*, *Missio spiritus sancti*, *Iudicium*, *Item de omnibus supradictis*.

⁴⁷ See Paris, BnF lat. 8098, fols. 227r–228v. This manuscript contains a copy of the third medieval revision of Petrus Riga's *Aurora*, and the verses in question appear at the end of the codex following the *Lamentationes Ieremie*.

⁴⁸ It is, of course, possible that some of these verses might have been conveniently excerpted already and were circulating as individual epigrams even before their inclusion in *Y*.

poet. This suggestion is supported by the presence in the anthology of a large number of unique poems, as well as the fact that some pieces incorporate in a new context verses that were already in circulation, for example, nos. 43, 44, and 53. The practice is not unusual. It is enough to remember William de Montibus's *Versarius* where poems by other writers and William's own compositions are combined to create a new poetic unity.

RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER ANTHOLOGIES

The anthology in York shares poems with at least six other English anthologies. Five of these anthologies are preserved in manuscripts of either earlier or roughly contemporary date (s. XII–XIII), and one is found in a codex from the fourteenth century.⁴⁹

- London, British Library Add. 24199 (s. XII)⁵⁰ (henceforth *Additional*)
- London, British Library Arundel 507 (s. XIV med.), fols. 69r–76v⁵¹ (*Arundel*)
- London, British Library Harley 956 (s. XIII), fols. 24r–34v⁵² (*Harley*)
- London, Sion College, Ms. Arc. L. 40.2/L. 12 (s. XIII), fols. 3r–14r.⁵³ (*Sion*)
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Digby 65 (s. XIII)⁵⁴ (*Digby*)
- Oxford, Bodleian Library Rawlinson G. 109 (s. XIII)⁵⁵ (*Rawlinson*)

⁴⁹ The anthologies with which *Y* shares only one poem are not included in the list, for example, London, British Library Cotton Vitellius A. XII (no. 10 in the anthology) and Cotton Titus D. XXIV (no. 29). Continental anthologies are not included either.

⁵⁰ See A. Bouteemy, "Le recueil poétique du manuscrit Additional 24199 du British museum," *Latomus* 2 (1938): 30–52. The author gives the incipits of the poems on fols. 68v–89r.

⁵¹ For a summary description of the manuscript, see *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, n.s., vol. 1, part I: The Arundel Manuscripts (London, 1834), 143–45. The text of the entire anthology is printed in C. Horstman, *Yorkshire Writers. Richard Rolle of Hampole: An English Father of the Church and His Followers*, 2 vols. (London 1895–96), vol. 1, Appendix II. Additions from Ms. Arundel 507, part II: A Collection of Latin Epigrams, pp. 420–35. Apart from the actual compilation, fifteen further epigrams were added in the margins throughout the manuscript; they are edited by Horstman at the end of the anthology and include two of the items that *Arundel* shares with *Y* (nos. 12 and 91).

⁵² This previously unstudied anthology contains a collection of short verses on various topics, mainly concerned with moral doctrine. See *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. 1 (London, 1808), 482–84.

⁵³ See N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, vol. 1 (London, 1969), 271–73. The original anthology was expanded in the fourteenth century with nineteen additional poems. These are found on fols. 1v–2v and 17r–33v (see below, no. 10).

⁵⁴ See Rigg, "Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies" (IV), 476 n. 22.

⁵⁵ See *ibid.*, 472–97.

<i>Y</i>	<i>Add.</i>	<i>Digby</i>	<i>Rawl.</i>	<i>Harley</i>	<i>Sion</i>	<i>Arundel</i>
6	x	x				
7						x (1 v.)
9	x	x				
10	x			x	x	x
12				x	x	x
20				x	x	
23					x	
26		x	x			
29	x	x		x		
35					x	
41				x	x	x
45		x				
46					x	
57				x		x
59				x		
61		x				
69				x		
91					x	x

All these collections, regardless of the poems they share with *Y*, differ from it in thematic scope and character. First, they contain poetic compositions on various topics, whereas *Y* is exclusively biblical. Second, they do not follow any organizational principle in the arrangement of the material, while *Y*, as examined above, presents in chronological order the major events in the life of Christ.

Even though *Y* shares three poems with *Additional* and four poems with *Digby*, its relationship with these two collections could be judged insignificant not so much on the basis of the relatively small number of shared items, but on the basis of the items' popularity. Nos. 6, 10 and 26 are in Hildebert's poetic corpus, while no. 29 is by Petrus Riga. The medieval reader held in high esteem the production of both Hildebert and Riga. Their poems are preserved in numerous manuscripts and the compiler of *Y* could have found them either as part of various anthologies or on their own. The anonymous poem "Misterio magno paschali uescimur agno" (no. 9), whose transmission is rather modest (three manuscripts at present), is the obvious exception from the group of famous compositions by Hildebert and Riga. Therefore, its presence in *Y*, *Additional*, and *Digby* could be used as an indicator of a direct

relationship between these three anthologies. Nevertheless, this relationship remains rather tenuous.

The situation changes slightly in relation to *Rawlinson*. Again nos. 26 and 29 can be excluded from the discussion, but apart from them *Y* shares with *Rawlinson* two further epigrams (nos. 45 and 61). Poem no. 61 is found in at least ten other manuscripts,⁵⁶ whereas poem no. 45 is preserved only in *Y* and *Rawlinson*, even though in *Rawlinson* it is part of a four-line composition. Thus, the link between *Y* and *Rawlinson* appears to be stronger than that observed between *Y*, *Additional*, and *Digby*, but it is still not very convincing. Three of the poems that *Y* and *Rawlinson* share (nos. 26, 29, and 61) could have been copied from a number of other witnesses, which leave us with only one epigram (no. 45) on which to base our claim for affinity between *Y* and *Rawlinson*.

In conclusion, the evidence we have is not strong enough to prove definitively the relationship between *Y* and the first three anthologies presented in the table above: *Additional*, *Digby*, and *Rawlinson*. The case, however, is different with the remaining three anthologies, *Harley*, *Sion*, and *Arundel*.

Y shares eight poems with *Harley* and as many with *Sion*. Neither of these anthologies has been studied before. They are large compilations of short poems and epigrams on various topics—biblical themes, moral doctrine, theology, liturgy, nature, and canon law. *Harley* contains 161 items, while *Sion* contains ninety-four poems to which nineteen further compositions were added in the fourteenth century.

Y, *Harley*, and *Sion* have in common four poems (nos. 10, 12, 20, and 41). Four additional poems are shared by *Harley* and *Y* (nos. 29, 57, 59, and 69), one of which (no. 69) has not yet been found in any other witnesses. All four items that are shared by *Sion* and *Y* (nos. 23, 35, 46, and 91) have been found in other compilations. Item no. 91, an epigram that appears also in *Arundel*, does not undermine the relationship between *Sion* and *Y*, because *Arundel* is a codex that is written much later than the other two. Despite the relatively large number of poems common to *Y*, *Harley*, and *Sion*, the order and the context of the shared poems is different in the three sources. Unlike the careful composition of *Y*, there is no apparent organizational principle in either *Harley* or *Sion*.

In conclusion, *Y* not only shares a relatively large number of poems with *Harley* and *Sion* (seven and eight respectively) but also contains compositions that are found exclusively in them. This implies a more tangible relationship. If the compiler of *Y* was indeed looking at different sources in search for poems to tell the story of salvation, he might have used *Harley* and *Sion*,

⁵⁶ Walther, *Initia*, no. 20654, lists three manuscripts. Seven additional manuscripts are recorded in *In Principio: Incipit Index of Latin Texts* (Turnhout, 1999).

choosing from them the pieces which were most suitable to his purposes. At the same time, it should be noted that the priority of *Harley* and *Sion* cannot be postulated with certainty. One reason for believing them prior to *Y* is the character of the York collection. Its more restricted subject matter (only biblical poems are included) and careful arrangement of the poems (the story of salvation is being explicated) suggest that a large amount of poetic material had probably been consulted by the compiler in order for him to be able to select the poems that fulfilled his design. It is more likely that the strictly biblical pieces were excerpted from collections of verses on various topics and subsequently arranged in meaningful order than that the biblical verses, which were already meaningfully arranged, were separated and randomly included in larger compilations. Nevertheless, the second scenario cannot be dismissed as impossible. Therefore, until further information is uncovered, the question of priority of *Y*, *Harley*, and *Sion* will remain unanswered.

Arundel was copied later than all the manuscripts discussed above, in the middle of the fourteenth century. It contains, together with the works of Richard Rolle, a collection of Latin epigrams that comprises 196 items. It shares six poems with *Y* (nos. 7 partially, 10, 12, 41, 57, and 91). Of these, four are also present in *Sion* (nos. 10, 12, 41, and 91), three are also found in *Harley* (nos. 10, 12, and 59), and only one is part of the compilation in *Additional* (no. 10). *Digby* and *Rawlinson* do not share with *Arundel* any of the poems listed in the table above. Interestingly, *Arundel* and *Y* have one verse in common from the poem on circumcision (no. 7): “Circumcidatur pes ad mala ne gradiatur.” The rest of the poem is not identical, but very similar.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ De circumcisione (*Y*)

Cor circumcidas ne turpia cogitet osque
Turpia ne dicat, oculum ne turpe uagetur,
Aures ne pateant unquam uerbis in honestis.
Circumcidet pedes ad turpia ne gradiantur,
Circumcidet manus ne que mala sunt operentur:
 Sic circumcidas singula membra tibi.
Hec aliter dici poterunt sensu sub eodem:
Circumcidatur pes ad mala ne gradiatur,
Circumcidet tuam lingua ne praua loquatur,
Circumcidatur oculus ne turpe uagetur,
Circumcidet cor ne uanum quid meditetur,
Circumcidet manum ne que mala sunt operetur,
Aures claudantur ne turpia precipiantur,
Naris ab illicito circumcidatur odore,
Semper ab illicito gustum cohibeto sapore,
Semper ab illicito coitu lumbos cohibeto:
 Sic circumcidet singula membra decet.

Circuncisio spiritualis (*Arundel*)

Sint circumcisa cuntorum membra nocua:
Circumcidatur os, ne uaga uarba loquatur,
Circumcidatur cor, ne uanis capiatur,
Circumcidatur oculus qui sepe uagatur,
Vnde suum uisum non dirigit in paradisum.
Circumcidatur auris, ne decipiatur
Friuola captando, sathane portam reserando;
Circumcidatur naris nec odore trahatur
Qui tibi fetorem sputet mortisque saporem.
Circumcidatur locus et res cui dominatur
Feruor lasciuus qui plus solet esse nociuus.
Circumcidatur manus, ut bona facta sequatur,
Circumcidatur pes, ad mala ne gradiatur.
Hec non carnalis lex est, set spiritualis.

It is impossible to determine whether *Arundel* was inspired by *Y* or whether the two sources preserve two independent versifications of the same theme. Nevertheless, the existence of these similar compositions provides interesting insights into the versifying techniques employed by the medieval poets and their skill in creating different poetic constructs from the same biblical material.

The evidence presented above suggests that the relationship between *Y*, *Harley*, *Sion*, and *Arundel* is more than circumstantial. Many of the poems preserved in and shared by these anthologies have not been recorded previously. The study of these new texts greatly expands our knowledge of the poetic repository from which the medieval versifiers drew inspiration and moral example. The relationship between *Y*, *Harley*, *Sion*, and *Arundel* deserves further examination that undoubtedly would bring to light more information about the circulation of poetic texts in medieval England. The careful investigation of these poetic compilations and their comparison with collections from the continent might also help us determine the extent to which the poetic repertoire differs according to geographical region.

TEXT OF THE ANTHOLOGY

<DE VETERI TESTAMENTO>

1⁵⁸

Efficiens causa Deus est formalis ydea,
Finalis bonitas, materialis yle.

2

Lux, firmamentum, tellus, luminaria, pontus,
Tandem solus homo formatur lumine sexto.

3⁵⁹

Sumpto de limo patre primo tempore primo,
Nascitur ex costis illius et uxori, et hostis.

⁵⁸ See William de Montibus, *Versarius*, no. 213 – CAUSA, ed. Goering, 410.

⁵⁹ Walther, *Initia*, no. 6217; H. Walther, *Proverbia sententiaeque latinitatis Medii Aevi*, 6 vols. (Göttingen 1963–65), no. 8713; edited in B. Hauréau, *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1891), 248. In all these works the incipit of the poem is “Facto de limo patre primo tempore primo.”

4

Sancta docente Deo datur archa Noe Phariseo,
A populis scelerum secum tulit omnia rerum.

5⁶⁰

Cham ridet dum membra uidet detecta parentis;
Iudei risere Dei penam pacientis.

6⁶¹

Melchisedech Domino panem uinumque litauit;
Christus idem statuens pactum uetus euacauuit.
Inter utrumque diu fuit alter sacrificandi
Ritus et optimuit ius qualecumque piandi.

5 Agnus enim legis carnales diluit actus,
Agnus presignans qui nos lauat hostia factus.
Hoc semel oblato cursum prior ille peregit
Quodque fuit signum, presens effectus abegit.
Quis locus aurore postquam sol uenit ad ortum,
10 Quis locus est uotis, tenuit cum nauita portum?
Lex aurora fuit, bos et capra uota fuere,
Crux sol, crux portus: hoc est, ea preteriere.
Crux clausit templum, crux soluit enigmata legis,
Sub cruce cessat ephot et deficit unctio regis.
15 Hircus, ouis, passer, ueruex et adeps uitulorum
Nil preconantur, Deus hostia finis eorum.
Parcat Hebreus oui, caro carnes abstulit are,
Est pecudum pecudes post Christum sacrificare.
Mortuus ille semel licet ultra non moriatur,
20 Idem cotidie sine uulnere sacrificatur.
In Christi carnem panis substancia transit,
Que uegetet mentem, non Christus inania sancsit.

fol. 52r

⁶⁰ Walther, *Proverbia*, no. 2710. See also Walther, *Initia*, no. 2674, where the incipit is slightly different: “Cham ridet dum nuda uidet pudibunda parentis.”

⁶¹ Walther, *Initia*, no. 10865. The poem is found also in *Digby*, fol. 58r, and *Additional*, fol. 43r–v. It has been printed many times, e.g., in PL 171:1193D–1196A (after Hildebert’s *De mysterio missae*) and PL 186:508D–509B (in *Zacharie Chrysopolitanus In unum ex quatuor sive De concordia evangelistarum libri quatuor* 4.156), and in *Hildeberti Cenomanensis Episcopi Carmina Minora*, ed. A. B. Scott (Leipzig, 1969), 30–32, no. 39.IV. See also *Herrad of Hohenbourg: Hortus Deliciarum*, ed. R. Green et al. (London, 1979), 1:261, no. 512.

Panis in altari, Deus in cruce, nil dubitetur
 Hoc uerbo uite fieri Deus ipse fatetur.⁶²

25 Hac in carne nichil carnale nichilue cruentum;
 Spiritus hanc tangit, uidet, accipit ad monumentum.
 Ordo sacer, bona tradicio, pia uictima panis,
 Inde procul facinus, procul horror et usus inanis.
 Secretum felix, noua uirtus, utile sacrum,
 30 Quo factus sanguis liquor est uitale lauacrum.
 Nam quia peccantes medicina semper egemus,
 Hanc pro peccatis medicinam semper habemus.
 Hec datur ad uitam, sed si reus hunc uerearisi,
 Qui patris ad dextram sedet et mactatur in aris.
 35 Ecce uides in lege typos et signa perisse,
 Ad propriumque caput sic sacramenta redisse.

7⁶³

De circumcisione

Cor circumcidas ne turpia cogitet osque
 Turpia ne dicat, oculum ne turpe uagetur,
 Aures ne pateant unquam uerbis in honestis.
 Circumcidere pedes ad turpia ne gradiantur,
 5 Circumcidere manus ne que mala sunt operentur:
 Sic circumcidas singula membra tibi.
 Hec aliter dici poterunt sensu sub eodem:
 Circumcidatur pes ad mala ne gradiatur,
 Circumcidere tuam linguam ne praua loquatur,
 10 Circumcidatur oculus ne turpe uagetur,
 Circumcididas cor ne uanum quid meditetur,
 Circumcidere manum ne que mala sunt operetur,
 Aures claudantur ne turpia percipientur,
 Naris ab illicito circumcidatur odore,
 Semper ab illicito gustum cohibeto sapore,
 15 Semper ab illicito coitu lumbos cohibeto:
 Sic circumcidi singula membra decet.

⁶² Before the order of verses was corrected in *Y*, vv. 23–24 preceded vv. 22 and 21.

⁶³ A similar poem, entitled *Circumcisio spiritualis*, is found in *Arundel*, fol. 74r. See Horstman, *Richard Rolle* 1:429–30, vv. 419–32. For more details, see above.

8⁶⁴

Veruex mactatur, Abrahe facto trutinatur;
 Velle pari uoto puer ara fit ense remoto.

9⁶⁵

De agno paschali

Misterio magno paschali uescimur agno:
 Sic sanxcita legis, sic sanxcit sanxcio legis.
 Non sumes magnum, nec fusci uelleris agnum,
 Vt caueas lites maculosaque dogmata uites.
 5 Agnum procura tenerum, sint uellera pura,
 Vt sit mens suplex, fidei confessio simplex,
 Vespera signetur, seculi iam finis habetur.
 Quo tenebre lumen genuit, quo femina numen,
 Agnus mactatur, consumptus non uiolatur.
 10 Non comedes crudum, nec aqua decoxeris udum,
 Ignis torrebit, comburet quod remanebit.
 Quomodo fit munda de uirgine sanguis ab unda
 Et dudum fusus nostros fumatur in usus;
 Vel caro fit panis, cum res non fiat inanis,
 15 Vires humane si querunt, fiet inane;
 Credatur digne, sacro signetur ab igne.
 Ista Deus condit, sed consignata recondit.
 Os non quassabis, rem sacram non temerabis,
 Non fermentabis, tibi laudes non agitabis.
 20 Vanescunt uerbis bona, si qua docendo superbis.
 Actio frustratur, si mens elata feratur.
 Sit solidus panis, ne gloria tollat inanis.
 Azima procures, sincerus uiuere cures.
 Mens compungatur, dum mors tibi commemoratur;
 25 Sint lacrime testes, herbe sumantur agrestes.

⁶⁴ Walther, *Proverbia*, no. 33210.

⁶⁵ Walther, *Initia*, no. 11545. The poem is found in *Digby*, fol. 60r–v, with a different title: *De immolatione agni qui Christus est*. See also Boutemy, “Le recueil,” *Latomus* 2, 32, no. 35 and edition on 44–45 (from *Additional*, fol. 78v). There are some differences between the text in *Y* and Boutemy’s edition; the most significant ones are in the two first verses, which are as follows in Boutemy’s edition: “Misterio magno legali uescimur agno / Tu consignabis qui consignata uocabis”).

Tunc ut amarescat ploret, lactuca sit esca;
 Denique sic comedes, tibi renes cingere debes
 Luxuriamque uita, uiuas ut celibe uita,
 Et manus armetur, baculus peccare minetur.

30 Non sit pes nudus, ne crimine sordeat udus,
 Calceus aptetur, uiuendi forma notetur.
 Qui precesserunt, uite tibi forma fuerunt:
 Sic manducabis festinanterque uorabis.
 Festinant, instant et paruo limite distant,
 35 Quos metuas hostes, signabis sanguine postes.
 Si consignetur limen, crux efficietur:
 Pone tibi sedem, si sic muniuersis edem,
 Pestis nulla pedem ponet, nec machina cedem
 Inferat ulla tibi, cum territus hostis abibit,
 40 Qui scelerum sordet maculis, quem culpa remordet.
 His caueat uescis, quas designauimus, escis;
 Mors est indigno, Christi caro uitaque digno.

10⁶⁶

De decem plagis

Prima rubens unda, rane tabesque secunda,
 Inde culex tristis, post musca nocencior istis.
 Quinta pecus strauit, uescas sexta creauit.
 Inde subit grando, post brucus dente nefando.
 5 Nona tegit solem, primam necat ultima prolem.

9 26 amarescat *Boutemy* : amaresca Y
 cedem *Boutemy* : tedem Y

28 luxuriamque *Boutemy* : luxuriam Y

38

⁶⁶ Walther, *Initia*, no. 14595; Stegmüller, *Repertorium*, no. 10238. The poem is found also in *Harley*, fol. 32r, *Sion*, fol. 2v, and *Arundel*, fol. 73r. In *Additional* the poem is found on fol. 54v among the works of Hildebert. See also A. Boutemy, "Notice sur le recueil poétique du manuscrit Cotton Vittelius A XII, du British Museum," *Latomus* 1 (1937): 282, no. 11, and "Notes additionnelles à la Notice de Ch. Fierville sur le manuscrit 115 de Saint Omer," *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 22 (1943): 25, no. XLVIIb. It has been printed repeatedly, e.g., in PL 171:1436C (no. 122 among the *Carmina Miscellanea* of Hildebert); PL 177:218A; PL 198:1150A (Additio 1); PL 199, 797B, *Hildeberti Carmina Minora*, ed. Scott, 21, no. 34; and Horstman, *Richard Rolle* 1:428, vv. 337–41; and it is also found in *Ioannis Saresberiensis episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive De nughis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum libri VIII* 8.21, ed. C. C. I. Webb, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1909), 2:379–80 (= PL 199:797B) and *Richard de Saint-Victor, Liber Exceptionum*, ed. J. Chatillon (Paris, 1958), Pars Prima, lib. 4, cap. 7, p. 132.

11⁶⁷

De decem preceptis

Ecce decem cordis resonat custodia legis:
 Cunctipotens unus non est alias Deus ullus;
 Ipsius nullam caueas formare figuram;
 Hoc nomen frustra non sumas, sabbata serua.
 5 Quatuor hec iussa conclusit prima tabella.
 Cetera sex tabule sic sunt inscripta secunde:
 Longius ut dures, habeas in honore parentes;
 Non ferias gladio, nec sis mechus neque latro,
 Non falsus testis, non sis inhians alienis.

12⁶⁸

Item

Disce Deum colere nomenque Dei reuerere,
 Sabbata conserues et honoret quisque parentes.
 Noli mechari, metuas de cede notari,
 Furta caue, fieri testis noli nisi ueri,
 5 Non cupias nuptas, nec res queras alienas.

13⁶⁹

De decem plagis et decem preceptis

Est homo sanguineus cui non colitur Deus unus.
 Rana loquax heresis reprobat nomen deitatis.
 Vt scinifex errant, qui sabbata sacra prophantan.
 Ille cinomia fit, qui patres ut canis odit.
 5 Fit pecus et moritur, quasi brucus adulter habetur.
 Feruor uesice feruens furor est homicide,
 Fur rapit exterius, Deus illum grandinat intus.

fol. 52v

13 3 scinifex = cinifex 4 cinomia = cynomyia canis] canes *Y* (*a.c.*)

⁶⁷ Walther, *Initia*, no. 5074; the poem without the first verse is also included as no. 3897.

⁶⁸ Walther, *Initia*, no. 4527; Stegmüller, *Repertorium*, no. 7404, 1. The poem is found also in *Harley*, fol. 30r, *Sion*, fol. 4v, and *Arundel*, fol. 54r. It has been edited in Horstman, *Richard Rolle* 1:434, vv. 605–9; and S. H. Thomson, *The Writings of Robert Grosseteste Bishop of Lincoln 1235–1253* (Cambridge, 1940), 141, no. 106: *Versus de X mandatis*. Thomson prints nine verses instead of five, but the added four verses are actually a separate poem on the Ten Commandments: “Sperne deos, fugito periuria, sabbata serua” (Walther, *Initia*, no. 18485).

⁶⁹ Walther, *Initia*, no. 5693.

10 Dente locusta nocet, falsus testis male mordet.
 Cor patiens tenebras rapit uxores alienas,
 Prima perit proles, fore si male quis cupit heres.

14⁷⁰

De Daniele

“Mane, techel, phares” iugi si mente notares,
 Rapta restaurares uel meliora dares.

DE NOVO TESTAMENTO

15⁷¹

Matheus hominis speciem generaliter implet,
 Iura sacerdotis Lucas tenet ore iuuenci,
 Marcus ut alta fremit uox per deserta leonis,
 More uolans aquile uerbo petit astra Iohannes.

16⁷²

Natus homo, uitulus moriendo leoque resurgens
 In pennis aquile Christus ad astra uolans.

17⁷³

Christus homo, Christus uitulus, Christus leo, Christus
 Est auis, in Christo cuncta notare potes.

18⁷⁴

Est homo nascendo Christus, uitulus moriendo,
 Est leo surgendo, Iouis ales summa petendo.

17 2 cuncta] hec annotat Y sup. l.

⁷⁰ Walther, *Initia*, no. 10647, and *Proverbia*, no. 14416 (four verses). For the first line of the couplet see also Walther, *Proverbia*, nos. 14413 and 14414. See William de Montibus, *Versarius*, no. 792 – MORS, ed. Goering, 439. Cf. Dan 5:24–28.

⁷¹ Walther, *Initia*, no. 10791. See Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 1.355–58, ed. Hümer, 41.

⁷² Walther, *Initia*, no. 11625a, and *Proverbia*, no. 15945. See Boutemy, “Notes additionnelles à la Notice de Ch. Fierville,” 25, no. XLVID, where this couplet is printed as a single poem together with the couplet that appears below as no. 37 in this anthology.

⁷³ Walther, *Initia*, no. 2770 (four verses); edited in PL 171:1390B, where the couplet is part of the poem *De quatuor evangelistis*, printed as no. 8 in Petrus Riga’s *Floridus Aspectus*.

⁷⁴ Walther, *Proverbia*, no. 7484; edited in A. Wilmart, “Poèmes de Gautier de Châtillon dans un manuscript de Charleville,” *Revue bénédictine* 49 (1937): 135 n. 3.

19⁷⁵

Matheo, Luce, Marco datur atque Iohanni
 Forma suis scriptis digna, sed apta Deo.
 Qui nascens, moriens, surgens condescendit in altum
 Sic homo, sic uitulus, sic leo, sic aquila.

20⁷⁶

De tribus Mariis

Anna tribus Ioachim, Cleophe Salomeque Marias
 Tres parit. Has ducunt Ioseph, Alfeus, Zebedeus.
 Christum prima, Ioseph, Iacobum cum Simone, Iudam
 Altera, que sequitur Iacobum parit atque Iohannem.

21⁷⁷

Ex Ioachim, Cleopha, Saloma tres Anna Marias
 Quas genuit iunxit Ioseph, Alpheo, Zebedeo.
 Vnius hec mater, hec quatuor, illa duorum.

22

Salue uirgo pia, Dominum paritura Maria,
 Innuba mater eris, paries et uirgo manebis!

23⁷⁸

Porta salutis aue, per quam patet exitus a ue;
 Venit ab Eua ue, quod quia tollis, aue.

20 3 prima] parit add. Y 21 3 unius] .i. Iesu annotat Y sup. l. quatuor] Iacob,
 Simon, Iude annotat Y sup. l. duorum] Iacobi, Iohannis annotat Y sup. l.

⁷⁵ Stegmüller, *Repertorium*, no. 1982 (in *Suppl.*): “Matthaeo, Lucae, Marco datur atque Iohanni.” See William de Montibus, *Versarius*, no. 417 – EWANGELISTE, ed. Goering, 420.

⁷⁶ Walther, *Initia*, no. 1062. This poem is found also in *Harley*, fol. 32v, *Sion*, fol. 8v, and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 8097, fol. 189v (after Riga’s *Aurora*). It has been printed many times, most recently in Panayotova, “Peter of Poitiers’s *Compendium*,” 331 n. 24, where both our nos. 20 and 21 are found; and A. Placanica, “Tradizione, esegesi e teologia nella *Iosephina* di Giovanni Gerson (Il *Trinubium* di Sant’Anna, La Genealogia di Christo, Le Nozze di Maria e Giuseppe),” in *La scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età medievale e umanistica*, ed. F. Stella (Florence, 2001), 222–23 and 227.

⁷⁷ Walther, *Initia*, no. 5992; Stegmüller, *Repertorium*, no. 9984, 2 (in *Suppl.*); U. Chevalier, *Repertorium hymnologicum*, 6 vols. (Louvain 1892–1920), no. 26271; edited in Hauréau, *Notices et extraits* 3:272.

⁷⁸ Walther, *Initia*, no. 14276: “Porta salutis aue, per te patet exitus a ue”; Walther, *Prover-*

24⁷⁹

Missus ad egregiam Gabriel tulit ista Mariam:
 “Innuba semper, aue, flos pulcher olensque suaue,
 Christum uentre feres, benedicta super mulieres.
 Solus erit saluus, tua quem saluauerit aluus.

5 Ex te nascetur qui sceptra Dauid moderetur,
 De fructu cuius spes germinis exiet huius.
 Nunc et in eternum geret hic diadema paternum,
 Iesus erit dictus, super omnia rex benedictus.
 O felix fructus, uertens in gaudia luctus!

10 O germen sanctum, neque tale fuit neque tantum!”
 Talibus auditis reddit uirguncula mitis:
 “Quomodo concipiā uel mater quomodo fiam,
 Que, sicut uoui, neque nosco uirum, neque noui?
 Corruptos artus sequitur conceptio partus;

15 Que coitum nescit, uterus suus unde tumescit?”
 Virgine sic fata uox est diuina relata:
 “Progenies Iesse, Deus est, qui sic iubet esse;
 Quique iubens esse, facit esse iubendo necesse.
 Spiritus eternus, casta, fauorque paternus

20 Intus obumbrabit uentre tūm grauidabit.
 Filius ipse Dei noctis sator atque diei,
 Rector celorum, Deus et Dominus dominorum,
 Nature gemine sine principio, sine fine,
 Vltimus et primus, longus, breuis, altus et imus,

25 Paruulus et magnus, magnus leo, paruulus agnus. fol. 53r
 Ex te mortalis, qualis pater ex patre talis;
 Et tu, stella maris, miseris eris auxiliatrix,
 Spes peccatorum, regina beata polorum,
 In terris totis pia, sancta uocabere uotis.

30 Iusticie solis genitrix sine semine prolis,
 Nec dubitare uelis, exemplo facta fidelis.
 Elisabeth sterili datus est in uentre senili

bia, nos. 21943 (first line) and 32990 (second line); Chevalier, *Repertorium*, no. 15154. The poem is found also in *Sion*, fol. 11r.

⁷⁹ Walther, *Initia*, no. 11115; Chevalier, *Repertorium*, no. 16126. The poem is printed in PL 171:1661A-C as no. 25 among Marbod's *Carmina varia* with the title *De anuntiatione Domini*. The first eight lines of the poem are printed also in F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry*, 2d ed. (Oxford, 1953), 276.

35 De marcente uiro magnus puer ordine miro.
 Lacte tumens pectus iam discit habere senectus,
 Pignore gaudet anus, gaudet quoque pignore canus.
 Partus cognate minor est et discrepat a te
 Iudex et preco non pondere penditur equo,
 Set tamen et similem serui probat ortus herilem.
 Si sterilis grauis est, si uirgo puerpera uis est,
 Vnam qui credit non hunc res altera ledit.
 40 Hinc cape, uirgo, fidem! Duo mira Deus facit idem.”
 Credula respondit: “Qui per te tanta sposondit,
 Vt saluet mundum, michi det tua uerba secundum.”

25

Vua liquat mustum, nubes pluit ethere iustum,⁸⁰
 Vmbra parit lumen, opus artificem, caro numen.
 Virgo nouam prolem, rubus ignem stellaque solem,
 Dant celi rorem, stirps uirgam uirgaque florem.

26⁸¹

5 Sol hodie nobis apparuit, unus et alter:
 Hic opus, ille opifex, hic leuis, ille manens.
 Imperat hic stellis, at ut imperat, imperat ille;
 Hic iubet ire dies, ille iubere iubet.
 Sol oritur cum sole Deo, cum lumine lumen,
 Lux cum luce, dies cum faciente diem.
 Virgo parit sine nocte diem, sine semine fructum,
 Fit grauis absque uiro, fit sine patre parens.

27⁸²

Nectareum rorem terris instillat Olimpus;
 Totam respurgunt flumina mellis humum.

⁸⁰ Y originally transposed vv. 1 and 3 but then corrected the order.

⁸¹ Walther, *Initia*, 18377; Chevalier, *Repertorium*, no. 19093. In London, British Library Cotton Titus A. XX, fol. 112r-v, the poem is eight lines longer and in *Digby*, fol. 28r, it is six lines longer. See also Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies” (I), 303, no. 36, and (IV), 486, no. 46 (eight lines longer). In PL 171:1435D the poem is entitled *De nativitate Domini* and is printed as no. 118 among Hildebert’s *Carmina Miscellanea*. The text in PL is ten lines longer.

⁸² Walther, *Initia*, no. 11711; Stegmüller, *Repertorium*, no. 6822; Chevalier, *Repertorium*, no. 39083. The poem has been printed many times; in PL 171:1382B-1383C (=P) it is entitled *De nativitate Christi* and appears as no. 1 in Petrus Riga’s *Floridus Aspectus*.

Aurea sanctorum rosa de prato paradisi
 Virginis in gremium lapsa, quieuit ibi.
 5 Intra uirgineum decus, intra claustra pudoris,
 Colligit angelicam uirginis aula rosam.
 Flos roseus, flos angelicus, flos ille beatus
 Vertitur in fenum, fit caro nostra Deus.
 Lumine plena suo manet in nascente potestas,
 10 Virgineum florens in pariente decus.
 Res noua, res celebris, res omni digna stupore!
 Et pudor et partus sunt sine lite simul.
 Quatuor hec partum commendant: uirginis auris,
 Vox Gabrielis, opus pneumatis, umbra patris.
 15 Virgo silet, loquitur Gabriel, inbalsamat aluum
 Spiritus et uirtus patris obumbrat ei.
 Virginis auris ibi fuit uxor, uir Gabrielis
 Sermo, dos almus spiritus, umbra pater.
 Sol tegitur nube, flos feno, cortice granum,
 20 Mel cera, sacco purpura, carne Deus.
 Vt nucleus teste quasi mel cere, uelut auro
 Iungitur argentum, sic caro iuncta Deo.
 Ergo si recte discernas singula, dices:
 Nux, fauus, electrum quod Deus est et homo.
 25 Nam duo iuncta nucem, duo iuncta fauum, duo iuncta
 Electrum statuunt et duo iuncta Deum.
 Solem stella parit, aurora diem, petra fontem,
 Patrem nata, Deum femina, uirgo uirum.
 Etheris ac terre superest quasi fibula, sancto
 30 Federis amplexu dissona regna ligans.
 O caste matris felix dignatio! Sese
 Terris inclinat hac mediante polus.
 Hec est illa parens sacra, cuius nomen in ore
 Est fauus, in corde lumen, in aure melos.
 35 Hec in qua celi pictor Deus intus et extra
 Pinxit et angelica cote poliuit eam.
 Quantum fas est credi? Deitas hanc tota refudit
 Et quasi succincta uenit ad illud opus.
 Lauit enim mentem carnemque sacrauit, ut esset
 40 Intus sincera mens caroque munda foris.

Splendor festiuus totam sibi uendicat illam,
 In qua prefulget omne decoris ebur.
 Angelice lucis speculum decor eius obumbrat,
 Huc oculum flectit curia tota suum.
 45 In titulos eius citharizant omnia celi
 Organa, celestis musica ludit ei.
 Hec est cella capax, ubi mel deitatis inundans,
 Compluit hanc pleno munera imbre sui.
 Stella maris, candoris ebur, speculum paradisi,
 50 Fons uenie, uite ianua, uirgo, uale.
 Celi scala, boni scola, pacis fibula, thuris
 Virgula, pigmenti cellula, uirgo, uale.
 De te tot laudum rutilant insignia, nescit
 Quo plus ascendat tantus honoris apex.
 55 Omnis uirtutum species et aromata tota
 Te simul aspergunt thuris odore sui.
 Tu sine defectu radius, tu flos sine spina,
 Tu sine nube dies, tu sine sorde parens.
 Quid loquor? Hinc nullum crementum laus tua sumet;
 60 Frustra luce facis templo iuuare diem.
 Quamque tuis pateat uirtutibus area, nullis
 Fasciculis laudum pandere lingua potest.

28

Nostre nature tunicam Deus induit, ipsam
 Virginis in talamo texuit ipse Deus.
 Spiritus hanc neuit opifex et texuit idem,
 Neuit uirgineo semine membra parans.
 5 Texuit ex membris animatum corpus adunans,
 Vt compago sacri corporis esset homo.
 Sic uerbum caro fit in uirgine, sic caro uerbum
 Vniat, ut sibimet copula sacra duo.
 Sic hominis natura Deo sociata cohesit,
 10 Vt natura Dei consocietur ei.
 Nil permutari facit incarnatio uerbi,
 Vnio naturam seruat utrique suam.
 Et natura duplex coit et sociatur in unam
 Personam carnem suscipiente Deo.

fol. 53v

15 Sic est conceptus de sancto pneumate Christus,
 Eius ut officio sit Deus et sit homo.
 Sic in matre satum de pneumate dicitur esse,
 Dum teneram prolem uirginis intus alit.
 Sic tunicam fullit, dum nutrimenta ministrat,
 20 Arte sua telas fullo minister alit.
 In latebris carnis speciem deitatis obumbrans
 Filius ex matre uirgine prodit homo.
 Nascenti puero, dum parturit unica uirgo,
 Prebuit illesum spiritus almus iter.
 25 Exiuit porta subtiliter irreserata,
 Prestitit integrum ianua clausa uiam.
 Virginis ex talamo tunicatus prosilit infans,
 Nec clausum deico corpore sensit iter.
 Celica progenies adiuuit parturientem,
 30 Ne noua sentiret semita carnis onus.
 Virginis in partu corpus cessit deitati,
 Corporis obsequio subueniente Deo.
 Tramite subtili proles egressa serenum
 Ingreditur nostra conditione diem.
 35 Sic sic ad nostros aspectus ducitur infans,
 Tunc prius enituit tincta colore caro.
 Quique suo talamo latuit uelut absque colore,
 Egressus tinctam cepit habere togam.
 Spiritus hanc tinxit, ut sit forma speciosus,
 40 Pre natis hominum ueste potitus ea.
 Sic net, sic texit, sic fullit sicque colorat
 Humanam Christi spiritus ipse togam.

29⁸³

Sol, cristallus, aqua dant qualemcumque figuram
 Virginei partus edificantque fidem.
 Si tinguatur aquis et soli subiciatur,
 Scintillas profert integer ille lapis.

⁸³ Walther, *Initia*, nos. 18366 and 18369; Chevalier, *Repertorium*, no. 40965. The initial six lines are found also in *Digby*, fol. 64r, where the title is *Similitudo uirginis partus*, and *Harley*, fol. 31v, where the title is *De cristallo*. See also Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies” (IV), 485, no. 33 (without a title, twenty verses long); and J. H. Mozley, “The Collection of Medieval Latin Verse in MS Cotton Titus D. XXIV,” *Medium Aevum* 11 (1942): 6, no. 16 (*Versus Hildeberti de Incarnatione Domini*, twelve verses). There are many editions, including PL 171:1406B–C, where the poem is entitled *De partu B. Virginis* and printed as no.

5 Flamine sic abluta sacro subiectaque soli
 Iusticie peperit integra uirgo Deum.
 Si bene cuncta notes, aqua, sol, cristallus, et ignis
 Sunt flamen, uerbum, uirgo, Deusque puer.
 Flamen aque, uerbum soli, uirguncula gemme,
 10 Stirps igni quadam condicione coit.
 Flamen aqua est, quia lauit eam; uerbumque supernum
 Sol, quia non uiolat et tamen intrat eam.
 Virgo lapis, quia uirgo parit; puer exprimit ignem,
 Nam uirtute micat, lumine corda replet.
 15 Sic uerbo flamen, ingressu celibe uerbum,
 Virgo fide, soboles carne Deoque simul
 Conficiunt cathaplasma nouum quo uita sepultis,
 Virtuti mores moribus ordo reddit.
 Hic aperit tumulos, hic agmina sacra refundit;
 20 Hoc suplex casu terra, iehenna, polus.
 Ad celos hoc subsilient cuius ossa medulle:
 Hoc animam carni reddit utrumque Deo.

30⁸⁴

Lumine solari nescit uitrum uiolari,
 Nec uitrum sole, nec uirgo puerpera prole.

31⁸⁵

Virgo Deum genuit, sed si quis quomodo querit,
 Non est nosse meum, sed scio posse Deum.

32

De tribus regibus

Primicias gentis mittunt partes orientis
 Ad cultum fidei reges uenere Sabei.

32 1 mittunt] sc. ad fidem *annotat Y sup. l.*

51 of Petrus Riga's *Floridus Aspectus*; and PL 203:1395, where only the first six verses of the poem are printed as no. 19 (*Comparatio de incarnatione Domini*) among Philippus de Harveng's *Carmina uaria*; and *Hildeberti Carmina Minora*, ed. A. B. Scott, Suppl. 1, pp. 54–55.

⁸⁴ Walther, *Initia*, no. 10474.

⁸⁵ Walther, *Initia*, nos. 20499; Chevalier, *Repertorium*, no. 34595. See also Walther, *Initia*, no. 20503, and Chevalier, *Repertorium*, no. 34596, where the incipit is "Virgo Deum peperit,

5

Splendorem stelle magi comitando nouelle
 Christum querebant et mistica dona ferebant.
 Christo dant dia munera quiske tria:
 Aurum, thus, mirram. Tribus his res sacra notatur;
 Auro rex, mirra mortalis significatur,
 Thure Deum uerum pagina sacra notat.
 Thusque sacerdotem sepe notare solet.⁸⁶

33⁸⁷

Item

Dat magus aurum, thus, mirram; rex suscipit aurum,
 Thura Deus, mirram qui moriturus erat.
 Thus orando damus, aurum sapiendo superna,
 Mirram dum carnis mortificatur opus.

34

Item

Melchio fert aurum, thus regi contulit Aspar,
 Tercius et mirra puerum Patipharsa uenustat.

35⁸⁸

Mistica sunt uas, thus, ignis; nam uase notatur
 Mens pia, thure preces, igne supernus amor.

36⁸⁹

De oblatione Domini

Corde puer purus are datur ara futurus;
 Ara futurus are uitiorum purus ad aram
 Fertur, aram mundans ara salutis are.

32 4 ferebant *scripsi* : ferebat *Y* 33 4 mortificatur] uel mortificamus *annotat Y sup. l.*

⁸⁶ This line seems to be given as an alternative to the preceding one.

⁸⁷ Walther, *Initia*, no. 4063. The poem is found also in Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek Sal. IX 30, fol. 149r. In PL 171:1275C the poem is entitled *Quid significant tria Magorum munera* and is printed as no. 2 among Hildebert's *Diuersorum Sacrae Scriptuae locorum applicatio moralis. De Nouo Testamento*. The poem is also printed in PL 203:1395A as no. 20 among Philippus de Harveng's *Carmina uaria*, with the title *Versus de muneribus magorum*.

⁸⁸ Walther, *Proverbia*, no. 15823. The poem is found also in *Sion*, fol. 5r. See William de Montibus, *Versarius*, no. 1256 – THVRIBVLVM, ed. Goering, 464.

⁸⁹ Walther, *Initia*, no. 3318.

37⁹⁰

De mutatione aque in uinum

Conuiae, mater, Christus, puer, architriclinus
 Dum sitiunt, orat, iubet, haurit, pocula laudat.

38⁹¹

Cum nouus a Domino Bachus datur architriclino
 Iussu diuino non est Tetis addita uino.

39⁹²

Dominus Christus loquitur

Fons ego sum uite, sicientes ergo uenite,
 Plenius haurite, ueri uelut Israelite.

40

Me Petrum petra depinxit nomine Petri,
 Vt fierem Petrus nomine petra fide.

Petrus

Dominor Andreas, sed opus quicumque uirile
 Induet, Andree nomine dignus erit.

Andreas

5 Nomine depingor Iacobi, depingor et actu
 Virtutem plantans extenuansque scelus.

Iacobus

Principium de principio, de lumine lumen
 Discussit scelerum nubila luce sua.

Iohannes

Ne lux uera nimis sit legis clausa sepulcro,

Thadeus

10 Tanquam mane nouum genitor geniti parat ortum.

Supplanto uicum, uirtutum germina planto,
 Vt Iacobus fiam nomine reque simul.

Iacobus

Lampadis os dico ex tali lampade lumen,
 Manauit fidei iusticieque nitor.

Philippus

15 Suspendentis aquas sum filius, India nouit
 Me duce uirtutem sanctificantis aque.

Bartholomeus

⁹⁰ See Boutemy, "Notes additionnelles à la Notice de Ch. Fierville," 25, no. XLVId; and see above, no. 16.

⁹¹ Walther, *Proverbia*, no. 4290 (four verses); edited in W. Meyer, *Die Oxford Gedichte des Primas* (Darmstadt, 1970), 75, no. XIV and n. 1 (reprint of *Nachrichten uon der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 1907, Heft 2, 113–75). The original six lines seem to have been expanded with different verses a number of times. The epigram in Y is one of these expansions. It is not included in C. J. McDonough, *The Oxford Poems of Hugh Primas and the Arundel Lyrics* (Toronto, 1984). Cf. Jo 2:9.

⁹² See Walther, *Initia*, no. 6727, which has a slightly different incipit: "Fons ego sum vite, salvandis dico: venite" (the second line is not indicated).

	Cum socios aquila uitulusque leoque figurent, Dat uultus hominis uisio sacra michi. Simon nomen erat, sed non sine nominis usu Nam Simon factis nomine, mente fui. India multiplici uitiorum nocte sepulta Agnouit uerum me reserante diem.	Mattheus Simon Thomas
20		fol. 54r

41⁹³

Quare turbe secute sunt Dominum
Morbus, mira, cibus, blasphemia, dogma fuerunt
Cause cur Dominum turba secuta fuit.

42⁹⁴

De Martha et Maria

“Marie morem partemque tibi meliorem
Elige,” mens oret, “dum pro te Martha laboret.”

43⁹⁵

*Congregate uobis thesauros in celo etc.*⁹⁶

Congregat in celis thesaurum quisque fidelis.
Collige thesaurum, qui uincat quodlibet aurum,
Fodere quem fures nequeant, nec rodere mures.

44⁹⁷

Nemo potest unquam dominis seruire duobus,
Terrenis opibus scilicet atque Deo.

⁹³ The poem is found also in *Arundel*, fol. 70v, and *Sion*, fol. 3r. It is edited in Horstman, *Richard Rolle* 1:423, vv. 136–37. See also Walther, *Proverbia*, no. 15057, where the incipit is “Morbus, signa, cibus, blasphemia, dogma fuerunt (fueru)”; the same incipit appears in William de Montibus, *Versarius*, no. 1373 – SEQUI CHRISTVM, ed. Goering, 471. Cf. the couplet in *Harley*, fol. 24v: “Morbus, amor, miranda, cibi, derisio, dogma / Hec sunt cur Dominum turba secuta fuit.”

⁹⁴ Walther, *Proverbia*, no. 14444a. See *Serlon de Wilton: Poèmes Latins*, ed. J. Öberg (Stockholm, 1965), 162, App. IV.2: *Exhortacio bona ad religiosos*, vv. 83–84.

⁹⁵ Walther, *Proverbia*, nos. 3088 (first line) and 2945 (second line): “Collige thesaurum qui gemmas uincit et aurum”). A verse similar to our third line is printed in the notes to no. 2945: “Tollere quos fures nequeunt nec rodere mures.” The text of this poem is difficult to determine. It is possible that the three verses presented here as no. 43 might be two separate epigrams, one of a single line (v. 1) and one of a couplet (vv. 2–3).

⁹⁶ Cf. Mt 6:20.

⁹⁷ Walther, *Proverbia*, no. 16405 (first line). The first line is printed in J. Werner, *Latinische Sprichwörter und Simmsprüche des Mittelalters* (Heidelberg, 1912), 52, no. 29. In both Walther and Werner the incipit is “Nemo potest digne dominis seruire duobus.” Cf. Mt 6:24.

45⁹⁸

Non sunt lensorum felicia regna polorum,
Sed uiolentorum quibus est pia uita laborum.

46⁹⁹

Est caro nostra lutum, patris est sapientia sputum;
Redditur humanum genus hoc medicamine sanum.

47

De decollatione sancti Iohannis Baptiste

Mens stupet omnimodis funesti crimen Herodis,
Qui uite tenebris et morum late celebris
Factus Herodiadem, cupiente patenter eadem,
Raptam germano sibi iunxit more prophano.

5 Et reprehendentem tantum scelus et prohibentem
Christi Baptistam rem carcere clausit ob istam
Dumque timendo fremit caput ense Iohannis ademit.
De tali causa Clio pre uiribus ausa
Pandere conatur quod amor furor esse probatur.

10 Turpis amor, dico, qui compare gaudet iniquo,
Quo qui uexatur, fatuum cor habere probatur.
Perdit honestatem, fit promptus ad impietatem,
Dira facit iussus, si que iubet impia luxus.
Sustinet angorem, fit hebes perditque pudorem,

15 Pallet, languescit, flet ut amens, nec requiescit.
Flens irridetur, postremo uilis habetur,
Huius tortor himen, comes est dolus, actio crimen
Cumque nimis sordet sacra spernit, honesta remordet.
Talis si maior fuerit, fit crimine peior,

20 Nam mala maiorum male sunt exempla minorum.

47 13 que *scripti* : quidem *Y*

⁹⁸ See Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies” (IV), 493–94, no. 132, where the couplet is part of a four-line epigram.

⁹⁹ Walther, *Initia*, no. 5623, and *Proverbia*, no. 7333. The poem is found also in *Sion*, fol. 7r. It is edited in L. Hervieux, *Les fabulistes latins depuis le siècle d'Auguste jusqu'à la fin du moyen âge*, 4 vols. (Paris 1884–99), 4:354. The couplet is quoted anonymously in *Martinus Legionensis, Sermonum liber*, Sermo 27, *De resurrectione Domini*, PL 208:976A. Martinus refers to the author as “quidam sapiens.”

Quis rogo dampnatur, duce si fugiente fugatur?
 Seruula non peccat, dominam si lusibus equat:
 Maiorum mores imitantur iure minores.
 Ergo per reges solitos postponere leges
 25 Plebes perduntur, pereunt dum probra secuntur,
 Quos est nemo fere presumat qui prohibere,
 Dum mortis dire metuit tormenta subire.
 Sed Domini preco, dum regi militat equo,
 Nec metuit funus, nec uult attendere munus.
 30 Regem peccantem, fratri thorum uiolantem
 Hinc reprehendebat, reprehendens corripiebat:
 “Quam male, rex,” inquit, “legem tua cura relinquit.
 Rex appellatus debes punire reatus.
 Non debes facere contagia, sed prohibere,
 35 Per reprobum morem tibi tollis regis honorem.
 Cur proprio generi non horres hostis haberi?
 Fratre tuo lesu te lesum perspice queso.
 Parcere cui poterit qui fratrem ledere querit?
 Num te turpares, nasum tibi si resecares?
 40 Sic te dedecoras, cum fratri res inhonoras.
 Siquis enim patris siquisue libidine fratri
 Polluit uxorem, proprium sibi tollit honorem.”
 Talia dicenti sancto, nec uera silenti
 Rex ob id iratus, uiciis et amore ligatus,
 45 Baptistam Christi reclusit carcere tristi.
 At cor Herodiadis predicte, ianua cladis,
 Inde cremabatur, quia non sibi posse dabatur
 Vatem perdendi crimenque licenter agendi.
 Nam rex predictus, quamuis in crimine strictus,
 50 Sanctum seruabat meritoque timebat, amabat
 Multaque complebat que sanctus precipiebat.
 Set rogo que pax est, ubi luxus feruida fax est?
 Nemo diu uere scit honesto scurra fauere;
 Cui placet incestus, spernit quod dicit honestus.
 55 Set pro peccato dat Herodes uincla beato,
 Qui scelus horrendum, scelus ingens uix reserendum.¹⁰⁰

47 27 *tormenta scripti* : *tormenta Y*

¹⁰⁰ A verse or verses seem to be missing here.

Fulgens externa sepelitur nocte lucerna,
 Suppliciis magnis plectuntur membra Iohannis.
 Angelus ipse quidem, uates et apostolus idem,
 60 Et plusquam uates dampnans scelus et leuitates,
 Et scola uirtutis, et uere preco salutis,
 Cultor honestatis, documentum uirginitatis,
 Testis ueridicus sponsique potentis amicus -
 Talem rex ledit, uitiis qui totus obedit,
 70 Talem uesanus, ferus, excors atque profanus
 Ledere rex audet. Quapropter? Adultera gaudet.
 Nam sceleratorum cibus est pressura bonorum
 Et laus rectorum nimius dolor est reproborum.
 Inuida turba bonis parat antrum perditionis
 75 Et dolet et plorat, cum sanctos mundus adorat.
 Hinc regina furit, quam flamma libidinis urit,
 Et miseris nodis uinctum cor hebescit Herodis,
 Cuius ego quedam ut crimina uersibus edam,
 Quis populus terre poterit mea carmina ferre?
 80 Quid memorem natos ab eodem sepe necatos?
 Aut parricida semper fuit aut homicida.
 Fratres occidit, templi uelamina scidit,
 Sacra prophanauit, pietatem nil reputauit,
 Luxurie fauit, iuris commercia strauit.
 85 Tutor predonum fuit ipse paterque latronum,
 Ciues, uicinos pessundedit et peregrinos.
 O male dux mortis, maledicte uictima sortis,
 Frangi mandatum properasque necare beatum!
 Talia digna mori gens munera dat monitori,
 90 Qui monet immites, sumit pro munere lites.
 Despicit ingratus quod agit loquiturque beatus,
 Set pia nunc tanti referatur passio sancti
 Inque meis odis facinus pingatur Herodis.
 Huius natalis prouenerat excialis,
 95 Pro quo mandauit proceres equitesque uocauit.
 Instituit cenam uariis speciebus amenam:
 Copia porcorum conciditur et uitulorum,
 Vrsi uel cerui, volucres taurique proterui
 Passim mactantur, ueniuunt et conglomerantur;
 100 Curia florebat, cortinis aula nitebat.
 Rex tumido uultu prodit cum diuine cultu,

fol. 54v

Ostro uestitus, diademate tum redimitus.
 Ingreditur theatrum, sequitur quem concio patrum,
 Hinc adolescentes assurgunt, inde potentes.

105 Carminibus fedis insistitur a citharedis
 Cumque iocis primos studet histrio uincere mimos,
 Rex turpis uisu quatit alta palatia risu.
 Tum dapifer fatur, cibus, o rex, acceleratur,
 Instruitur mensa, iam sunt mantilia tensa.

110 Ablue queso manus, prior accipe fercula sanus,
 Cor firmat panis, “ue” clamat uenter inanis.
 Hec princeps audit dictoque libenter obaudit,
 Accubuit primus, discubbit maior et imus.
 Et propter proceres regem residere uideres,

115 Esce ponuntur diuersaque uina feruntur,
 Nec desunt lusus, set adest ibi lubricus usus.
 Hausto pigmento, conuentu iam temulento
 Prodiit e cella gemmis ornata puella,
 Filia regine, uia mortis, causa ruine,

120 Murice uestita, cura studioque polita.
 Velabant illi collum scapulasque capilli
 Distorti, pexi tenuique ligamine flexi.
 Regia uestis ei tribuebat uim speciei,
 Ora rubor pingit, latus aurea fibula cingit,

125 In pedibusque pares aurati sunt sotulares.
 Flammeus aspectus, gracilis uox, mobile pectus,
 Mollior incessus, leuitatem sermo professus
 Sunt quasi tormentum petulanter respicientum.
 Laudat eam cetus facinus laudare suetus.

130 Rex iubet ut ludat, parens ea brachia nudat.
 Membra per anfractus ad turpes complicat actus,
 Vertitur, erigitur, pudor hic perit et sepelitur.
 Hec caput exaltat Fedreque simillima saltat
 Dumque facit gestus, nimios exsuscitat estus.

135 Ista placent regi, cui res placet obuia legi;
 Inde calens felle promittit aitque puelle:
 “Dic quecumque uoles. Pete queuis, regia proles.
 Si prece non segni medium uis poscere regni,
 Hoc sine lite dabo, nec summa nec ima negabo.”

140 Hec ait, hec iurat quia nil nisi crimina curat:
 Bachus, rex unus, facit hoc promittere munus.

145 Statim saltatrix repetens tentoria matris
 Singula narravit, quam mox sic ipsa rogauit:
 "Quid poscam, mater?" Cui serpens intulit ater:
 "Pro preciis magnis caput expete queso Iohannis."
 Belua nequam, rem cupis equam sic abolere,
 Nil nisi tanti funera sancti queris habere.
 Pane doloris, fonte cruaris te recreabis,
 Clade piorum, morte bonorum te saciabis.

150 Mortis imago, summa uorago, uipera sua,
 Parcere nescis, nec requiescis, dirior Eua.
 Femina zelo subdere prelo querit amantes,
 Perdere penis, ense, uenenis uult dominantes.
 Mens mulierum, fallere clerum uult iuuenesque;
 155 Hec inhonestat uique molestat sacra senesque.
 Ira leonis, uisque draconis, uis mulierum
 Ridet habenti, nescit egenti dicere uerum.
 Femina callens et bene psallens et ioculatrix
 Est populorum non minimorum depopulatrix.

160 Femina ludens, non bene prudens, sed speciosa
 Est dolor orbis, tot quia morbis est uitiosa.
 Res odiosas et uiciosas edificare,
 Relligiosas et speciosas uult resecare.
 Deteriori non meliori consociatur,

165 Pernicies est, nec requies est, cum dominatur.
 Talis regina fuit hec dicenda latrina
 Cum propria nata colubri de carne creata,
 Que modo pro lusu, pro turpi scilicet usu,
 Contemptis dampnis caput expetiere Iohannis.

170 Ergo saltatrix auditio famine matris
 Introit ad cenam sobrio non agmine plenam.
 Huc ingressa cito petulanter rege petito
 Inter conuiuas ait: "O rex optime, uiuas!
 Munus saltanti promissum redde roganti!"

175 "Queris quid munus?" "Baptiste postulo funus,
 Abscisum cuius michi ferro militis huius
 Da caput in disco, nil plus uolo tollere fisco.
 Hoc michi reddatur, ne fallax rex habeatur,

180 Nam nimis est miserum regem non dicere uerum
 Spemque fidemque gregis minuit fallatia regis.”
 Filia demonis, archa libidinis, ossa gehenne,
 Numinis obuia, fulminis esca caosque perhenne,¹⁰¹
 Sic mala diligis et bona negligis, ampla ruina,
 Fornice niteris et nece pasceris atque rapina.

185 Non satus altior est neque sanctior ex muliere
 Hoc patre quem fera nunc tua uiscera sic sitiere.
 Hinc rex fit tristis pro uerbis scilicet istis,
 Nec scelus expauit, sed tristiciam simulauit.
 Nam ne periurus uideatur rex epicurus

190 Vel contristetur que poscere magna uidetur,
 Ad facinus trahitur, confestim mittit et itur
 Et decollatur, cui par homo nemo probatur.
 O scelus inuisum! Sancti caput ense recisum
 Aulicus in patina defert uelut exta caprina

195 Ante recubantes, ludentes atque bibentes.
 Horret conuentus spectata cede cruentus,
 Omnia turbantur, conuiuia commaculantur,
 Nonnulli merent, nonnulli planctibus herent.
 Mortem Baptiste puto plangit mens cithariste;

200 Si liceat credi, lira torpet uoxque tragedi,
 Vituperant multi regis conuiuia stulti.
 Femina letatur saltatrix atque iocatur,
 Saltans dat plausus, plaudens hos despicit ausus.
 Nam decollati sumens caput ipsa beati

205 Continuo matri dedit illud, imago baratri.
 Hec mors doctoris uulgatur plena doloris
 Et non paucorum grex uenit discipulorum,
 Corpus humo condit, dans fletus, pectora tundit.

210 Hac patet offensa quam sit bona sobria mensa,
 Quod ualet ebrietas sibi nullas ponere metas.
 Turpis amor uero que dat mala denuo quero?
 Turpis amor scelerum fons est, destructio rerum,
 Interitus gentis mulieris dicta sequentis,
 Namque iuuentutem perimit tollitque salutem

215 Sepius et uilis fit ob hoc persona senilis.
 O rex celorum, merces et cura tuorum,

fol. 55r

¹⁰¹ In order to correct the rhyme, I propose “Numinis obuia, fulminis auia, caos perhenne.”

Cur sortis dire pena permittit obire,
 Quos celo donas, quos mox super astra coronas?
 Vt reus opprimitur, qui recte uiuere scitur,
 220 Cum pius emoritur, aliquando uix sepelitur.
 Florent peccantes, mundi decus huius amantes,
 Sanctos spernentes, que sunt inhonesta sequentes.
 Nullum tormentum formidat turba nocentum,
 Viuit securus grex demonis esca futurus;
 225 Isti multantur, non regnant, nec uenerantur.
 Hec tamen illa dies, qua iudex, rex bone, fies,
 Singula discernet mundique cacumina sternet,
 Iustis serta dabit, non iustos igne cremabit.
 Tunc famulos fessos, peccati pondere pressos
 230 Nec petimus dampnes, sed protege, sancte Iohannes.
 Dilue nostrorum prece sordes flagitiorum
 Et cum purgatis nos sedibus adde beatis. AMEN

48

De diuite et Lazaro

Victus, uestis, opumque domi dum diues habundat,
 Lazarus ante fores esurit, alget, eget.

49

Cerne ualere parum thesaurum diuiciarum,
 Cum requies Lazarum teneat, cremet ignis auarum.

50

Lazarus meritis multus, Iob rarus habetur:
 Infirmi multi, patiens uix inuenietur.

51

Lazarus es, unde Christus laudetur abunde;
 Iob sic esse potes, te penes ista notes.

52

Quem preciosorum delectat mensa ciborum,
 Quem uestis bissus, post mortem sordet abissus.

51 1 Lazarus] .i. infirmus *annotat Y sup. l.* 2 Iob] .i. paciens *annotat Y sup. l.*

53¹⁰²

Viceribus plenus, languens, despectus, egenus
Fit socius superum, finita sorte dierum.

54

Purpura punitur, dampnatur splendida cena;
Pauper cum moritur, ad celi transit amena.
Cur eris cumulos queris uel res perituras,
Cur fabricas lapidum, fabricas tandem ruituras?
5 Cur titulos cupis aut loculos, qui talia cernis?
Stultus eris, si pretuleris terrena supernis,
Si pauper fueris Christi, celo pocieris.

55

Parua licet mica Christo si detur amica
Mente, minas minuit hec uiciumque luit.

56¹⁰³

De sex operibus misericordie
Panem poscenti prebe, potum sicienti,
Nudatos operi, tecta uagis aperi.
Clausis solamen, egris confer medicamen,
Quo defunctus eget, non tua cura neget.

57¹⁰⁴

Vestio, poto, cibo, tectum do, uisito, soluo.

58

De tribus mortuis a Domino suscitatis
Intro, foris, sub humo, recubat, uehitur, ueterascit,
Nata ducis, uidue gemitus, fetoris amicus.
Intro “domi,” foris “a foribus,” sub humo “monumento”;

¹⁰² The first line of this couplet is modeled after Hugh Primas's verse “Viceribus plenus uictum petit eger egenus.” See Meyer, *Gedichte des Primas*, 51, no. V, v. 1; McDonough, *Poems of Hugh Primas*, 34, no. 5, v. 1; and Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies” (IV), 483, no. 5. Cf. Lc 16:20.

¹⁰³ Walther, *Initia*, no. 5536, and *Proverbia*, no. 7207. In both the incipit is “Escam poscenti prebe, potum sicienti.” The rest of the poem is the same.

¹⁰⁴ The poem is found also in *Arundel*, fol. 76v, and *Harley*, fol. 29v, where it is entitled *De operibus misericordie* and consists of three lines: “Vestio, poto, cibo, tectum do, uisito, soluo / Quo defunctus eget non tua cura neget / Commodo compatior conuerto dono remitto.” It is edited in

5 Mors primum hunc, primum hanc, primum illum mistica signans.
 Hinc, illic, in ibi, mors prima, secunda, suprema,
 Praua, reum, fetens typice sunt mens, opus, usus.

59¹⁰⁵

De cena Domini

Rex sedet in cena, turba cinctus duodena;
 Se tenet in manibus, se cibat ipse cibus.

60¹⁰⁶

In Domini cena Iude sunt nota uenena;
 Vt tradat Dominum, linquit lupus agmen ouinum.

61¹⁰⁷

Vita beata - Deus - mortem gustauit ad horam,
 Vt miser eternum uiuere posset homo.

62

Eclipsim patitur sol uerus, uita moritur,
 Mors dampnata perit, dum uitam perdere querit.

63

Mortua mors moritur, mors mortua morte recessit,
 Dum crucis in ligno mortua uita fuit.

64¹⁰⁸

Vincla, flagella, mine, crux, clavus, lancea, spine
 Felici fine nostre sunt meta ruine.

65

Victima festiuia, uitulus sacer, hostia diua
 In cruce mactatur, perit anguis, ouis reuocatur.

Horstman, *Richard Rolle* 1:433, v. 593; and Hervieux, *Les fabulistes latins* 4:349. See William de Montibus, *Versarius*, no. 719 – OPERA MISERICORDIE (two verses), ed. Goering, 436.

¹⁰⁵ Walther, *Initia*, no. 16778, and *Proverbia*, no. 26863. The poem is found also in *Harley*, fol. 33r (*De corpore Christi: Christus in hac cena cinctus turba duodena*) It has been printed, e.g., in Wilmart, “Poèmes de Gautier de Châtillon,” *Revue bénédictine* 49, 135, no. 29.

¹⁰⁶ Walther, *Proverbia*, no. 11739a.

¹⁰⁷ Walther, *Initia*, no. 20654. See Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies” (IV), 495, no. 150.

¹⁰⁸ Walther, *Initia*, no. 18565, and *Proverbia*, no. 30270. In both the incipit is “Sputa, flagella, mine, crux (or probra), clavi, lancea, spine.” The poem is edited in Hervieux, *Les fabu-*

66

Vt seruos redimat, Deus in cruce uictima pendet;
 Rex ad iudicium ueniens sua cuique rependet.

67

Quos Adam primus, quos perdidit Eua uirago,
 Suscitat alter Adam sicut docet eius imago.

68

Iesus in hoc ligno nos saluat amore benigno,
 Nominis esse ratum liquet huius significatum.
 Intuitu tristi spectetur passio Christi,
 Eliciat lacrimas compassio cordis opimas.

69¹⁰⁹

Per quadraginta se morti tradidit horas
 Tam cruce quam tumulo Christus. Totidemque diebus
 Festa resurgentis celebramus ad eius honorem.

70

Dant probra, uerbera, uincula, uulnera, crux et arundo,
 Fel et acetum, lancea, letum, uiuere mundo.

71

Mors perit inferni sub regis morte superni;
 Mortuus ex pomo morte reuixit homo.

72

Militis iniusti per regis uulnera iusti
 Vulnera curantur, per penam gaudia dantur.

73

Qui semper uiuit, ad tempus Christus obiuit,
 Mortem contriuit, uitam fluidis stabiliuit.

70 1 probra] uel mea *annotat Y sup. l.*

listes latins 4:353; and in Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria Nova*, vv. 1407–8, ed. Faral, 240. The first line in Faral's edition is "Spreta, flagella, minae, probra, clavi, lancea, spinae."

¹⁰⁹ The poem is found in *Harley*, fol. 31r, with the title *De pasca* and with the first line "Pasca quaterdenis cur hoc sit queritur audi," which is missing in *Y*.

74

In cruce mors uite noua mors est mortis auite,
Crux mortis pena, fit uite gloria plena.

fol. 55v

75

Panis qui uiuit, dum mortis iura subiuit,
Qui cecidit pomo, pane resurgit homo.

76

Crux prius ingratum dans dedecus et cruciatum,
Christo sacrata decus est et gloria grata.

77

Vndique crux uergens, crux undique crimina tergens,
Quatuor inmundi mundauit climata mundi.

78

Ligno dampnatur, ligno mundus reparatur,
Ligno ditatur, ligno serpens spoliatur,
Ligno uita datur, ligno mors orta necatur.

79

In cruce Mars Marte, fallens ars fallitur arte,
Vitam uita dabat, mors mortem mortificabat.

80

Morti uita datur, mors in cruce mortificatur,
Inferni nisus periere, patet paradisus.

81

Dat mortem pastus fructu uetito prothoplastus;
Dat uitam Iesus, ligni uite sacer esus.

82

Morte crucis Iesus quasi muscipule datur esus,
Hostis inescatur, agno lupus et superatur.
uel Quo fit inescatus serpens uetus et superatus.

77 2 mundauit] uel mundabit *annotat Y sup. l.*
82 1 datur] uel fuit *annotat Y sup. l.*

climata] confinia *annotat Y sup. l.*

83

Qui nullius eges, quo regnant principe reges,
In cruce pro nobis hostia factus obis.

84

Quem captiuarat predo, seduxerat anguis,
Sic Dominus seruum liberat, agnus ouem.

85

Victos in ligno nos a uictore maligno
Christus in hoc signo crucis eximit ordine digno.

86

Victima paschalis dum se crucis applicat alis,
Ad ueteris morbi medicinam consultit orbi.

87

Regnat sullimis Christus crucifixus in imis,
Vltima qui primis et egenos iungit opimis.

88

Vincla, flagella, crucem, conuicia, uulnera, mortem
Et tumulum passus regit astra, solum, mare Christus.

89

Flagris, felle, minis, cruce, clavis, cum nece spinis:
His homo - terra, cinis - celo uiuet medicinis.

90

Gustu lesa caro gustu reparatur amaro,
Culpa manus tegitur, manus ut clavis aperitur.
Mortis et erroris fluxum fugat unda cruaris,
Dat Zabulo frenum, raptum soluens alienum.

91¹¹⁰

Dignos morte premi, sic uos a morte redemi
Qui cruce uos emi, sum cruce dignus emi.
Nonne uides quanti michi sis homo? Sim tibi tanti.
Si uis felicem te fore, redde uicem.

¹¹⁰ The poem is found also in *Arundel*, fol. 6r (lower margin), and *Sion*, fol. 3r. In both the

92

Quid contemplaris? Morior, ne tu moriaris.
Hoc homo tormento meus est; cognosce, memento!

93¹¹¹

Cur homo miraris? Morior, ne tu moriaris.
Mors tua pena michi, mors mea uita tibi.

94¹¹²

Piscator pater, mundus mare, filius hamus,
Esca caro, ferrum deitas, generatio Christi
Linea; Leuiathan piscis, qui dum uorat escam,
Occidens Christum, captus deitate tenetur.

95

In cruce tollo crucem, moriens de morte triumpho,
Viuificans hominem, mortificatus homo.

96¹¹³

His homo deliciis, hac te crucis arte redemi,
Fortiter infirmus dum mortem morte peremi.

97

Hoc opus, hic sanguis, hec uulnera testificantur
Quantum Iesus amat, pro quibus ista tulit.

98¹¹⁴

Nil modo placat ouis, nil sanguis agit uitulorum,
Nil holocausta bouum, periit uetus ordo sacrorum.
Iam iam desistat pecudes mactare minister,
Ex quo mactari uenit pius ipse magister.

two couplets are transposed. The poem is printed in Horstman, *Richard Rolle* 1:434, vv. 627–30, where the four verses are part of a ten-line composition. This shows that the two couplets belong together, even though they both have coloured initials (as individual entries) in *Y*.

¹¹¹ Walther, *Initia*, no. 3922; Chevalier, *Repertorium*, no. 25208; edited in A. Wilmart, *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du moyen âge latin* (Paris, 1932), 414. The first verse is printed in Hildebert's *Inscriptionum Christianorum Libellus*, no. 35 (see PL 171:1284A).

¹¹² Walther, *Initia*, no. 14128; edited in PL 171:1270B; and Scott et al., “The Biblical Epigrams of Hildebert,” Appendix, no. 4, pp. 313–14.

¹¹³ See Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria Nova*, vv. 1409–10, ed. Faral, 240.

¹¹⁴ See Petrus Pictor, *Carmina*, ed. van Acker, 18–19, *Liber de sacramentis (Carmen)*, vv. 71–74.

99

Anteus noster proprio lapsu releuatur,
 Per cuius lapsum genus humanum reparatur.
 Labitur et uincit, qui uictor erat spoliatur,
 Improbus et predo ruit et preda spoliatur.
 5 Christus sponte cadens post casum glorificatur,
 Hostis et antiquus proprio telo iugulatur.
 Ne tantum noceat, quantum nocuisse probatur,
 Ignitis loris apud infernum religatur.
 Ergo dies letus Christi sub honore colatur,
 10 Quo tumulo surgens mortis uictor dominatur.

100

Vir, leo, bos, aquila, cherubim, rota, uirga, man, urna
 Atque due tabule signant hominemque Deumque.

101

Aluus de celo, presepe recepit ab aluo,
 Crux de presepi, de cruce tumba Deum.

102¹¹⁵

Serpens, femina, uir, genitor, uirgo, caro, uita
 Fallit, dat, sumit, redimit, nutrit, lauat, intrat
 Euam, fel, mortem, mundum, Christum, scelus, astra
 Spe, fructu, gustu, uerbo, gremio, cruce, morte.

103¹¹⁶

Nascitur, abluitur, patitur, moritur, sepelitur,
 Surgit, frangit, abit, scandit, tribuit, remeabit.

99 1 Anteus] .i. Christus *annotat Y sup. l.* 10 dominatur] sc. ubique *annotat Y sup. l.*
 103 1 nascitur] de uirgine *annotat Y sup. l.* abluitur] in Iordane *annotat Y sup. l.* patitur] iniurias *annotat Y sup. l.* moritur] in cruce *annotat Y sup. l.* sepelitur] in sepulcro *annotat Y sup. l.* 2 surgit] a morte *annotat Y sup. l.* frangit] infernum *annotat Y sup. l.* abit] de inferno *annotat Y sup. l.* scandit] in celum *annotat Y sup. l.* tribuit] spiritum sanctum *annotat Y sup. l.* remeabit] ad iudicium Christus *annotat Y sup. l.*

¹¹⁵ Walther, *Initia*, no. 17573; edited in Hauréau, *Notices et extraits* 1:385.

¹¹⁶ Walther, *Initia*, no. 11568, and *Proverbia*, no. 15894a (first line). In both the incipit is "Nascitur, abluitur, patitur, descendit ad ima."

INCIPITS OF THE POEMS IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER

Alius de celo, presepe recepit ab aluo (101)
 Anna tribus Ioachim, Cleophe Salomeque Marias (20)
 Anteus noster proprio lapsu reuelatur (99)
 Cerne ualere parum thesaurum diuiciarum (49)
 Cham ridet dum membra uidet detecta parentis (5)
 Christus homo, Christus uitulus, Christus leo, Christus (17)
 Congregat in celis thesaurum quisque fidelis (43)
 Conuiae, mater, Christus, puer, architriclinus (37)
 Cor circumcidas ne turpia cogitet osque (7)
 Corde puer purus are datur, ara futurus (36)
 Crux prius ingratum dans dedecus et cruciatum (76)
 Cum nouis a Domino Bachus datur architriclino (38)
 Cunctipotens unus non est alius Deus unus (11)
 Cur homo miraris? Morior, ne tu moriaris (93)
 Dant probra, uerbera, uincula, uulnera, crux et arundo (70)
 Dat magus aurum, thus, mirram; rex suscipit aurum (33)
 Dat mortem pastus fructu uetito prothoplastus (81)
 Dignos morte premi, sic uos a morte redemi (91)
 Disce Deum colere nomenque Dei reuerere (12)
 Ecce decem cordis resonat custodia legis (11)
 Eclipsim patitur sol uerus, uita moritur (62)
 Efficiens causa Deus est formalis ydea (1)
 Est caro nostra lutum, patris est sapientia sputum (46)
 Est homo nascendo Christus, uitulus moriendo (18)
 Est homo sanguineus cui non colitur Deus unus (13)
 Ex Ioachim, Cleopha, Saloma tres Anna Marias (21)
 Flagris, felle, minis, cruce, clavis, cum nece spinis (89)
 Fons ego sum uite, sicutientes ergo uenite (39)
 Gustu lesa caro gustu reparatur amaro (90)
 His homo deliciis, hac te crucis arte redemi (96)
 Hoc opus, hic sanguis, hec uulnera testificantur (97)
 Iesus in hoc ligno nos saluat amore benigno (68)
 In cruce Mars Marte, fallens ars fallitur arte (79)
 In cruce mors uite noua mors est mortis auite (74)
 In cruce tollo crucem, moriens de morte triumpho (95)
 In Domini cena Iude sunt nota uenena (60)
 Intro, foris, sub humo, recubat, uehitur, ueterascit (58)
 Lazarus es, unde Christus laudetur abunde (51)
 Lazarus meritis multus, Iob rarus habetur (50)
 Ligno dampnatur, ligno mundus reparatur (78)
 Lumine solari nescit uitrum uiolari (30)
 Lux, firmamentum, tellus, luminaria, pontus (2)

Mane, techel, phares iugi si mente notares (14)
 Marie morem partemque tibi meliorem (42)
 Matheo, Luce, Marco datur atque Iohanni (19)
 Matheus hominis speciem generaliter implet (15)
 Me Petrum petra depinxit nomine Petri (40)
 Melchio fert aurum, thus regi contulit Aspar (34)
 Melchisedech Domino panem uinumque litauit (6)
 Mens stupet omnimodis funesti crimen Herodis (47)
 Militis iniusti per regis uulnera iusti (72)
 Missus ad egregiam Gabriel tulit ista Mariam (24)
 Misterio magno paschali uescimur agno (9)
 Mistica sunt uas, thus, ignis; nam uase notatur (35)
 Morbus, mira, cibus, blasphemia, dogma fuerunt (41)
 Mors perit inferni sub regis morte superni (71)
 Morte crucis Jesus quasi muscipule datur esus (82)
 Morti uita datur, mors in cruce mortificatur (80)
 Mortua mors moritur, mors mortua morte recessit (63)
 Nascitur, abluitur, patitur, moritur, sepelitur (103)
 Natus homo, uitulus moriendo leoque resurgens (16)
 Nectareum rorem terris instillat Olimpus (27)
 Nemo potest unquam dominis seruire duobus (44)
 Nil modo placat ouis, nil sanguis agit uitulorum (98)
 Non sunt lensorum felicia regna polorum (45)
 Nostre nature tunicam Deus induit, ipsam (28)
 Panem poscenti prebe, potum sicienti (56)
 Panis qui uiuit, dum mortis iura subiui (75)
 Parua licet mica Christo si detur amica (55)
 Per quadraginta se morti tradidit horas (69)
 Piscator, pater, mundus, mare, filius, hamus (94)
 Porta salutis aue, per quam patet exitus a ue (23)
 Prima rubens unda, rane tabesque secunda (10)
 Primicias gentis mittunt partes orientis (32)
 Purpura punitur, dampnatur splendida cena (54)
 Quem captiuarat predo, seduxerat anguis (84)
 Quem preciosorum delectat mensa ciborum (52)
 Qui nullius eges, quo regnant principe reges (83)
 Qui semper uiuit, ad tempus Christus obiuit (73)
 Quid contemplaris? Morior, ne tu moriaris (92)
 Quos Adam primus, quos perdidit Eua uirago (67)
 Regnat sullimis Christus crucifixus in imis (87)
 Rex sedet in cena, turba, cuncta duodena (59)
 Salue uirgo pia, Dominum paritura Maria (22)
 Sancta docente Deo datur archa Noe Phariseo (4)
 Serpens, femina, uir, genitor, uirgo, caro, uita (102)

Sol, cristallus, aqua dant qualemcumque figuram (29)
 Sol hodie nobis apparuit unus et alter (26)
 Sumpto de limo patre primo tempore primo (3)
 Veruex mactatur, Abrahe facto trutinatur (8)
 Vestio, poto, cibo, tectum do, uisito, soluo (57)
 Victima festiuia, uitulus sacer, hostia diua (65)
 Victima paschalis dum se crucis applicat alis (86)
 Victos in ligno nos a uictore maligno (85)
 Victus, uestis opumque domi, dum diues habundat (48)
 Vincla, flagella, crucem, conuicia, uulnera, mortem (88)
 Vincla, flagella, mine, crux, claus, lancea, spine (64)
 Vir, leo, bos, aquila, cherubim, rota, uirga, man, urna (100)
 Virgo Deum genuit, sed si quis quomodo querit (31)
 Vita beata Deus mortem gustauit ad horam (61)
 Vlceribus plenus, languens, despectus, egenus (53)
 Vndique crux uergens, crux undique crimina tergens (77)
 Vt seruos redimat, Deus in cruce uictima pende (66)
 Vua liquat mustum, nubes pluit ethere iustum (25)

NUMBERS IN WALTHER, *INITIA* AND *PROVERBIA**Initia* *Proverbia*

1062 (20)	10865 (6)	2710 (5)	26863 (59)
2674 (5)	11115 (24)	2945 (43)	30270 (64)
2710 (5)	11545 (9)	3088 (43)	32990 (23)
2770 (17)	11568 (103)	4290 (38)	33210 (8)
3318 (36)	11625a (16)	7207 (56)	
3897 (11)	11711 (27)	7333 (46)	
3922 (93)	14128 (94)	7484 (18)	
4063 (33)	14276 (23)	8713 (3)	
4527 (12)	14595 (10)	11739a (60)	
5074 (11)	16778 (59)	14413 (14)	
5536 (56)	17573 (102)	14414 (14)	
5623 (46)	18366 (29)	14444a (42)	
5693 (13)	18369 (29)	14416 (14)	
5992 (21)	18377 (26)	15057 (41)	
6217 (3)	18565 (64)	15823 (35)	
6727 (39)	20499 (31)	15894a (103)	
10474 (30)	20503 (31)	15945 (16)	
10647 (14)	20654 (61)	16405 (44)	
10791 (15)		21943 (23)	

HENRY OF GHENT'S TEACHING ON MODES AND ITS INFLUENCE IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

Isabel Iribarren

HENRY of Ghent (ca. 1217–93) adopted a line of thought that emerged as the opposition to some of the innovative ideas condemned in Paris in 1277—a condemnation in which, as is well known, he took an important part as a member of the commission of theologians assisting Stephen Tempier. Nonetheless, Henry's teaching bore important repercussions upon theologians such as Giles of Rome, John Duns Scotus, and Durandus of St. Pourçain, who developed some of their thinking in response to Henry's position.

The influence of Henry's thought on later theologians can be best appreciated through his conception of “modes of being.” We can predicate of a thing, Henry says, by signifying the thing itself, in its essence, or by signifying the thing as having a certain mode of being. In the first instance, a thing (*res*) is signified in its full ontological status as an extra-mental reality. In the second instance, a thing is signified under a certain mode of being which has no reality whatsoever considered apart from its foundation on the thing itself. According to Henry, relation is such a mode of being which draws its entire reality from its foundation. Thus, if we say that “Socrates is as tall as Plato,” we are predicating a relation of equality between Socrates and Plato, whereby Socrates acquires a mode of being “towards Plato.” This mode of being “towards another” characteristic of relation cannot, however, have in itself any ontological value, unless, Henry says half-heartedly, we understand “thing” to signify not only fully actual things, but also the modes of things.¹

¹ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. IX*, q.3 (ed. R. Macken, *Henrici de Gandavo Opera omnia* 13 [Leuven, 1983], 56.85–89): “relatio realitatem suam contrahit a suo fundamento, et quod ex se non est nisi habitudo nuda, quae non est nisi modus quidam rem habendi ad aliud, et ita non res quantum est ex se, sed solummodo modus rei, nisi extendendo rem ut etiam modus rei dicatur res . . .” (my italics). The *Opera omnia* (Leuven and Leiden, 1979–) include critical editions of *Quodl. I, II, VI, VII, IX, X, XII*, and *XIII*; this article will use *Quodlibet VII*, ed. G. A. Wilson, *Opera omnia* 10 (Leuven, 1991) and *Quodlibet IX*, ed. Macken. For the quodlibets not yet published in the series, this article will use the J. Badius edition of 1518, reprinted as *Quodlibeta Magistri Henrici Goethals a Gandavo Doctoris Solemnis*, 2 vols. (Louvain, 1961).

Henry was never conclusive in tackling this problem, and this left it open for interpretation. On the one hand, he was well aware of the theological difficulties implied in denying all reality to modes. For if the divine persons are to be distinguished according to the different modes in which they emanate from the essence, then something has to be said for the reality of modes, lest one jeopardizes the plurality of the persons. The divinity becomes an absolute essence and the Trinity is, as a result, dissolved. On the other hand, if the reality of modes is asserted in its distinction from the reality of their foundation, the plurality of the persons is emphasized at the expense of the simplicity of the divine essence, with the risk of tritheism. Both options were clearly unorthodox and failed to explain the reality of the triune God. It therefore became the task of later scholastics to devise a way of explain the reality of the Trinity without thereby jeopardizing divine simplicity. Henry of Ghent's teaching on modes provided one way of dealing with this issue.

I will attempt to show how Henry's teaching on modes served as the foundation for early fourteenth-century accounts on the Trinity, notably that of two Dominicans, James of Metz (inc. ca. 1304) and Durandus of St. Pourçain (ca. 1275–1334). The Trinitarian accounts of these two theologians were in principle modelled after Henry's doctrine on modes, but whereas Durandus's account earned the censorship and persistent criticism of his order, James's account went unscathed. In this light, their theologies provide good grounds upon which to assess the value of Henry's modal doctrine in later scholastic discussions. What was it in Durandus's account that triggered so much polemic? Was it something intrinsic in Henry's teaching on modes? If so, then why did James not earn the same degree of opposition?

In attempting to answer these questions, I shall present first a brief outline of Henry's general metaphysics as the context for his teaching on modes, then an examination of his modal doctrine as applied to categorical and divine relations, and finally an analysis of his notion of intentional distinction. I will then attempt to assess Henry's influence upon Durandus of St. Pourçain through the line conveyed by James of Metz. The *status quaestionis* in this last section concerns the connection between relation and its foundation, that is, whether it should be understood as a type of distinction or as a type of identity.

Of Henry's works, my investigation will be mainly based on the quodlibets and on the *Summa quaestionum ordinariarum*.² The *Summa* contains all of his

² Three volumes of Henry's *Summa* have appeared in the *Opera omnia*: articles 31–34, 35–40, and 41–46. In this paper I will use *Summa (Quaestiones ordinariae)*, art. 31–34, ed. R. Macken, in *Opera omnia* 27 (Leuven, 1991), and art. 41–46, ed. L. Hödl, in *Opera omnia* 29 (Leuven, 1998). For the articles that have not yet appeared in the series, I will use the J. Badius 1520 edition, reprinted as *Summa quaestionum ordinariarum*, 2 vols. (New York, 1953).

lessons at the time of his “ordinary disputes,” running chronologically parallel with his quodlibetal disputations. Both works were composed in the period from 1276 to 1292.³ For James of Metz, I will mainly refer to the first recension of his commentary on the *Sentences*, written between 1295 and 1300.⁴ Finally, of Durandus’s works, I will mainly draw from the first recension of his commentary on the *Sentences* (ca. 1307).⁵ I will refer to the final recension of his commentary and his quodlibetal disputations only when illustrative.

1. HENRY'S GENERAL METAPHYSICS

The starting point of Henry’s metaphysics is the notion of being. It is a primary concept in the sense of logical priority, insofar as all other notions are

³ See J. Paulus, *Henri de Gand: essai sur les tendances de sa métaphysique* (Paris, 1938), xiv–xvii. Concerning the *Summa*, Paulus proposes the following dates for the articles treated in this paper: a.32 q.5, ca. 1279; and a.55, q.6, ca. 1285–86. Cf. J. Gómez Caffarena, “Cronología de la ‘Suma’ de Enrique de Gante por relación a sus ‘Quodlibetos,’” in *Gregorianum* 38 (1957): 133. See also M. G. Henninger, *Relations: Medieval Theories 1250–1325* (Oxford, 1989), 40–42.

⁴ The oldest and most complete manuscript for James of Metz’s first recension (A) of the *Sentences* commentary (written after 1295 and before 1300) and the *Additiones* (written shortly after 1300) is Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale 992, from the early fourteenth century. The second recension (B) of the *Sentences* commentary (written after 1300 and before 1302) is best preserved in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Borges. 122 (fourteenth century). The relation between the recension A of the commentary and the *Additiones* is also important: Koch believes that the latter is not the result of external criticism (Hervaeus’s *Correctorium* presupposes the *Additiones*) but of James’s polemic with John of Paris, a debate also recorded by the latter’s commentary on the *Sentences*. See J. Koch, *Jakob von Metz, O.P., der Lehrer des Durandus de S. Porciano, O.P.*, in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 4 (1929–30): 169–207. Cf. T. Kaeppli, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1975), 330–31; and F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, vol. 1 (Würzburg, 1947), 186–87.

⁵ We only know with certainty of two versions of book I of Durandus’s commentary on the *Sentences*: (A) his *prima lectura*, and (C) the last revision of his commentary. We still do not have any conclusive evidence that there is a middle version (B) for book I of Durandus’s commentary. Version A constitutes Durandus’s original teaching in some Dominican *studium* in Paris, before reading the *Sentences* at the University proper; it is contained in its entirety in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14454. As for the dates of the different recensions of Durandus’s commentary, see J. Koch, *Durandus de S. Porciano O.P. Forschungen zum Streit um Thomas von Aquin zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* 26 (Münster i.W., 1927), 22–77; Stegmüller, *Repertorium* 1:84–92 and Kaeppli, *Scriptores* 1:339–50, all agree on 1307/8 for A, 1311 for B, and 1317–25 for C. For the latest research on the threefold recension of Durandus’s *Sentences* commentary, see C. Schabel, R. Friedman, and I. Balkoyiannopoulou, “Peter of Palude and the Parisian Reaction to

contained in the concept of being.⁶ Henry develops this idea by adopting a Neoplatonic outlook inspired in the Augustinian notion of divine ideas:⁷ every thing (*res*) has its own idea in God and to that extent every thing has being (*esse*) on account of its imitation of the divine essence.⁸ The creatures' intrinsic possibility is therefore founded on the divine ideas, that is, in God's knowledge of his essence not only in itself but also as capable of being imitated by others. These relations of imitability are the divine ideas, as the various ways in which God's essence can be imitated. The terms of these relations are the essences of creatures, which are real insofar as they possess "essential being." An idea is not a definition (*ratio*) but a thing under the aspect of essence, that is, a thing as *species specialissima*.⁹ Therefore, all second intentions, such as relation apart from its foundation, as well as genera, differences, individuals, and privations, do not constitute proper ideas in God.¹⁰

Following Avicenna, Henry states that the *quidditas* or the essence of a thing can have three types of existence (*esse*): as a singular in extra-mental reality, in the intellect only, or in itself. Accordingly, an essence can be considered under different aspects: as existing outside the intellect; as existing only mentally; or as existing in itself as an absolute thing and previous to its particular existence outside the mind or as a universal.¹¹ As for this third way

Durand of St. Pourçain on Foreknowledge and Future Contingents," *Archivum fratrum predicatorum* 71 (2001): 183–300.

⁶ See in this respect Avicenna, *Liber de philosophia prima sive scientia divina*, 3 vols., ed. S. Van Riet (Louvain and Leiden, 1977–83), tract. I, cap. 5.

⁷ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. VII*, qq. 1–2 (ed. Wilson, 5.45–51): "... Sunt namque ideae principales quaedam formae vel rationes aeternae, quae divina intelligentia continentur, secundum quas formatur omne quod oritur, et quarum participatione sit ut sit, quidquid est, quo modo est." Henry understands "participation" as "imitation," which is how an example is said to participate of its exemplar cause. For Augustine, see *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII* 46.2, ed. A. Mutzenbecher, CCL 44A (Turnhout, 1975), 71–73. See also E. Gilson, *Introduction à l'étude de Saint Augustin*, 4th ed. (Paris, 1969), 260 ff.

⁸ By *esse* Henry means not an individual being but a universal essence; that is, Peter's own individual being is not an idea in God, but rather his humanity is (*esse humanitatis*). See *Quodl. VII*, qq. 1–2 (ed. Wilson, 3.4–12).

⁹ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. VII*, qq. 1–2 (ed. Wilson, 8.5–7): "idea autem non est ratio nisi rei sub ratione completi in natura et essentia, quae non est nisi in specie specialissima."

¹⁰ Ibid. (ed. Wilson, 18.31–33): "isti octi modi entium proprias ideas in Deo non habent: intentiones secundae, relationes, artificialia, genera, differentiae, individua, privationes et numeri."

¹¹ Ibid. (ed. Wilson, 18.43–19.57): "quidditas est essentia rei, licet solum duplex esse habet, unum scilicet in singularibus extra intellectum, aliud in ipso intellectu, quadruplicem tamen habet considerationem. Unam ut est in ipsis singularibus extra. Aliam, ut habet esse in intellectu. Aliam ut abstrahitur a singularibus et iterum applicabile est eisdem per predicationem. Quartam vero habet considerationem secundum se et absolute, ut dicit Avicenna, *non est nisi*

of considering essences, Henry understood Avicenna to hold that essences cannot only be considered in this absolute way, but can also *exist* absolutely. In this connection, Henry asserts that an essential being has a mode of existing which is in itself an essence, prior to its being in the intellect as a universal or in extra-mental reality as a particular thing.¹²

These essential things do not necessarily correspond to particular extra-mental things, but they are ideas in themselves, and thus are in the divine essence as forming that essence itself. In this way humanity, for example, is an essence in the divine mind, by which man is created (*conditus*) as such.¹³ Henry calls then a “thing” (*res*) whatever is a nature or an absolute essence,¹⁴ which in its turn can be a rational entity (“thing” from the Latin *reor*, to suppose, to imagine, to believe), or an entity of extra-mental reality (“thing” from the Latin *ratitudo*, fixed, established, settled).¹⁵ “Real thing,” therefore, includes what actually exists, whether necessarily (only God) or contingently (all creatures), and all possibles. Creatures can exist essentially as possibles, and can only begin to exist actually at creation, as “existential beings” (*esse existentiae*). All things which exist in extra-mental reality (as do categorical beings) enjoy the ontological status of existential beings.¹⁶

2. CATEGORICAL AND DIVINE RELATIONS

A category is a thing (*res*) to which it is fitting to exist.¹⁷ The categories are for Henry a classification of the ways in which existential beings can participate of God’s essence.¹⁸ Henry considers the categories in a twofold way: in their being (*esse*) and in their *ratio*. The being of a category is whatever is included by essence in some categorical order. The *ratio* of a category is the mode of being proper to those things contained in the categorical order. It is by the categorical being and its *ratio* that the categories themselves are constituted and differentiated.¹⁹

quod est, ut humanitas non est nisi humanitas tantum, cui omnia alia accident, scilicet esse in singularibus et esse in intellectu, esse universale, esse particulare. . . .”

¹² Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. III*, q.9; *Quodl. I*, q.9; *Summa* 43.2.

¹³ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. VII*, qq.1–2 (ed. Wilson, 19.62–79): “. . . Humanitatem appellat ipsam humanitatis essentiam ut in mente divina est per suam ideam, qua homo *conditus* est.”

¹⁴ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. V*, q.6.

¹⁵ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. VII*, qq. 1–2; *Quodl. V*, qq.2, 6; *Summa* 21.2.

¹⁶ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. III*, qq.2, 9.

¹⁷ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. V*, q.2 (154v): “praedicamentum est res cui convenit esse. . . .”

¹⁸ Henry of Ghent, *Summa* 32.5; *Quodl. V*, q.2; *Quodl. VII*, qq. 1–2 (ed. Wilson, 22.28–52).

¹⁹ Henry of Ghent, *Summa* 32.5; *Quodl. XV*, q.5 (577r); *Quodl. V*, q.2 (154v).

All categorical realities have the mode of existing of participated being. Categories are names of things and as such can be predicated of things in three ways: (1) by signifying the thing in itself and absolutely; (2) by signifying the thing as having a certain mode of being; (3) by signifying the mode of being itself and apart from the thing. According to the second of these, a category is said to be the name of a thing only insofar as the mode of being is considered as founded on its subject and under the *ratio* of its subject. This way of understanding a category Henry calls *secundum rationem characterizationis*: that is, the mode of being of a category assumes the “character” of the subject upon which it is founded. So, for example, the relation of similarity considered as founded upon the accident of quality, has the accidental characteristic of its absolute foundation and relates to it intrinsically. Henry describes the “characterization” of the mode of being by its subject as a “determination” (*determinatio*). The mode of being is seen as a genus determined (that is, “differentiated” in the Aristotelian sense²⁰) in its being by its foundation, and in this way a category acquires its reality and is said to be a *nomen primae impositionis*.²¹ On the other hand, according to the third way in which a category can be predicated of a thing, if the thing is considered under the *ratio* of its mode of being, the category is always a name of second intention; it is only a *genus generalissimum*, the name of a concept without a reality of its own.²² Since only what is a thing or signifies a thing (*nomen primae*

²⁰ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. IX*, q.3 (ed. Macken, 56.82–89): “Quam quidem realitatem contractam a fundamento respectu habitudinis indeterminatae, Simplicius appellat differentiam . . . Propter quod saepius alibi diximus quod relatio realitatem suam contrahit a suo fundamento . . .” (for the remainder of the quotation, see n. 1 above). Henry adopts this description of a mode of being and its relation to the foundation from Simplicius, *De praedicamentibus*. See A. Pattin, W. Stuyven, and C. Steel, eds., *Commentaire sur les Catégories d’Aristote*, 2 vols. in *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum* 5 (Louvain-Paris and Leiden, 1971–75). In fact, Henry draws heavily from Simplicius in his view on the categories, especially in the terms *nomen primae impositionis* or *secundae impositionis* as applied to the categories.

²¹ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. IX*, q.3 (ed. Macken, 55.52–56.89 ff.). Initially formulated by Porphyry (A. Busse, ed., *Eliae in Porphyrii Isagogen et Aristotelis Categorias Commentaria*, in *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* 18.1 [Berlin, 1900], 57–58) and Boethius (*In Categorias*, PL 64:159–296), names of first imposition are conventional signs of extra-mental entities, whereas names of second imposition are conventional signs of mental entities. The distinction between names of first and second imposition is closely connected to the distinction between names of first and second intention. First intentions are natural signs of extra-mental entities and second intentions are natural signs of first intentions. See C. Knudsen, “Intentions and impositions,” in N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny, and Jan Pinborg, eds., *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1996 [1982]), 484–85.

²² Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. IX*, q.3 (ed. Macken, 56.85–89); *Quodl. VII*, qq.1–2 (ed. Wilson, 31.72–32.84).

impositionis) is an idea in God, modes of being considered simply as *nudus modus* are not in their own right ideas in the divine mind.²³

Some categories, like substance, quality, and quantity, not only differ according to modes of being and different *rations*, but are distinct also as things and essences.²⁴ Thus, there are two ways of participating in the divine essence: by being in itself (substantial being), or by inhering in another reality as its subject (accidental being). The latter is in its turn differentiated into absolute and relative being. In the first case, the accident is added to the substance in either one of two ways: by qualifying it (quality), or by measuring it (quantity). Qualities and quantities have in common with substance that they are real things in the sense that they exist absolutely as terms of divine ideas, that is, as various ways in which God can be imitated. According to Henry's ontology of absolute natures and their relation to the eternal ideas, therefore, the only created things that properly exist are substances, qualities, and quantities. They all signify an essence to which being pertains.²⁵ Relative inheritance, on the other hand, is differentiated into seven different ways. These last seven categories are not things in themselves, but are "as it were of the thing" (*quasi rei*), and show the circumstances surrounding the thing.²⁶ The first three categories, by contrast, signify real essences to which correspond different modes of being, so that to the different *esse* which are *subsistere*, *afficere*, *mensurare*, correspond different *res*, namely substances, qualities, and quantities.²⁷

In what concerns the specific category of relation, *esse ad aliud* is understood as a mode of being which an absolute thing (a substance, a quality, or a quantity) can acquire, since one and the same thing can be simultaneously absolute and relative.²⁸ This is because the formal *ratio* of a relation does not

²³ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. VII*, qq.1–2 (ed. Wilson, 34.54–35.68): "... cum idea non est nisi rerum, idcirco relationum et respectum dicimus non esse aliquas proprias ideas."

²⁴ *Ibid.* (ed. Wilson, 32.85–91).

²⁵ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. V*, 6.

²⁶ This sharp division between the absolute categories and the last seven "relative" categories is adopted by Henry from a text by Boethius concerning the types of predication: "Quod aliae quidem [praedicationum] quasi rem monstrant aliae vero quasi circumstantias rei; quodque illa quae ita praedicantur, ut esse aliquid rem ostendant, illa vero ut non esse, sed potius extrinsecus aliquid quodam modo affigant" (Boethius, *De Trinitate* 4, ed. G. P. Goold [Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1973], 99–104). Henry quotes Boethius in *Summa* 32.5 (199r).

²⁷ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. VII*, qq.1–2; also *Summa* 32.5; *Quodl. V*, qq.2, 6; *Quodl. XV*, q.5; and *Quodl. VIII*, q.2: where he adds *esse ad aliud* as another mode of existing.

²⁸ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. VII*, qq.1–2 (ed. Wilson, 32.92–33.4); *Quodl. XV*, q.5 (577v): "Caetera vero novem respectu illius dicuntur entia aliquid et quasi secundum quid et diminute: quia non dicuntur aut sunt entia, nisi quia sunt dispositiones entis simpliciter quod est substantia." Like the mainstream Thomistic opinion, for Henry relation has the least ontological value (*ens secundum quid et diminute*), even though it is founded upon a truer and more perfect being

signify a subjective thing, but rather signifies the condition of a subject towards another. So when Paul is said to be related to Peter in their similar whiteness, there is one thing (Paul as a substance) with two modes of being, one absolute (the quality of whiteness) and one relative (the similarity to Peter). Relation, as the other relative categories, can be understood either as a pure mode of being, or as being “characterized” by the reality of its foundation. As a pure mode of being, relation does not signify any particular thing unless, Henry adds, it is called a “thing” by extending the meaning of “thing” to the mode of a thing.²⁹

Despite this hesitant remark, Henry states in repeated occasions that if one can call relation a thing it is solely on account of its being really (*ex natura rei*) founded on a thing.³⁰ A real relation is called a thing from (*ex*) the reality of its foundation, and it is only as such that it *really* refers to its term. The term of the relation does not account for its reality; rather, *because* a relation acquires the reality of its foundation, it can be said to refer *really* to its term. For if it were the case that the reality of a relation were determined by its term, then a father would have as many paternities as he has sons.³¹ That a relation may refer to different terms is not a *causa propter quam*, but a *causa sine qua non* of its reality.³² In this way, divine relations are real because they are founded on the reality of the divine essence independently of the operation of the intellect. Likewise in creatures, real relations are those founded on a real thing on account of the thing itself (*ex natura rei*) and prior to the opera-

than the other six relative categories. See Aquinas, *I Sent.* 26.2.2 ad 2; *De potentia* 2.5; *De veritate* 27.4; *Summa contra Gentiles* 4.14. See also Aristotle, *Metaph.* 14.1 (1088a23, b3). For a brief study of Henry’s view on real relation, see J. Decorte, “Giles of Rome and Henry of Ghent on the Reality of a Real Relation,” *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 7 (1996): 183–211.

²⁹ See n. 1 above.

³⁰ Henry of Ghent, *Summa* 55.6 (111v): “Sed tunc non est disputatio nisi de nomine, appellando extenso nomine rem quod alii appellant modum rei. Attamen si sic respectus possint dici res, hoc non est nisi quia ex natura rei fundantur in vera re.”

³¹ Ibid. (111r): “licet [relatio] non appellatur res simpliciter, quia etsi respectus qui sequitur ex natura rei, possit dici res vera aliquo modo, hoc non convenit ei ratione illa et comparatione qua est ad aliud, sive ex eo quod est respectus, aut relatio. Alter enim non esset una res sed plures, neque una realitas sed plures, respectus ille qui esset ad plures terminos. Et sic non esset una relatio secundum rem qua unus est aequalis duobus, neque una paternitas qua unus est pater duorum filiorum in creaturis, cum sint duo terminos ad quos, quod falsum est . . . relatio quod ipsa est res vera sive realis, hoc accipit ab alio, ut a suo fundamento.”

³² Ibid. (111v): “Quia enim realiter et ex natura ipsius rei fundantur in re secundum dictum modum ut dicantur res ex ordine ad fundamentum, ideo etiam realiter respiciunt obiectum, et dicuntur res *in* ordine ad obiectum, non autem *ex* ordine ad obiectum. Non enim respicere obiectum realiter dat eis quod sunt res etiam in comparatione ad obiectum; immo e converso, quia enim sunt res *ex* ordine ad fundamentum, etiam sunt res *in* ordine ad obiectum, et etiam realiter respiciunt obiectum” (my italics).

tion of the intellect.³³ A relation, therefore, both in creatures and in the divinity, does not need to be a thing in order to be real: it is real because it assumes the reality of its foundation.

There is a difference, however, between relations in creatures and relations in God. Relation, as has been said, can be understood in two ways: as an accident, inasmuch as it is founded upon absolute accidents; and as a mode of being, that is, as belonging to its categorical genus of being towards another. Whereas in creatures relations are accidental beings which differ from the mode of being of the substance, in God all accidents which are attributed as accidents assume a substantial being.³⁴ Therefore, relation in God only preserves its mode of being as *esse ad aliud*, but not its accidentality. The *ratio* of a relation remains as such in the divinity on account of the term to which it refers and not on account of the divine essence. For insofar as relation is referred to the essence, it is not *ad aliquid* but an *aliquid*.³⁵

In an interesting passage, Henry says that although the church condemns as quaternarism the view that divine relation is a thing (*res*),³⁶ to say so is never-

³³ Ibid. (111r); *Quodl. III*, q.4 (53r): the criterion for a real relation (*relatio secundum esse*), according to Henry, is that there is an “essential order between the related terms” (*essentialis ordo inter relata*), when the *quidditas* of the relation is to refer to another term *ex seipsa*, and not on account of something added to it. In this respect, Henry summarizes (51r) Avicenna’s statement that a real relation is that which exists in particulars according to their reality and not according to the operation of the intellect only (*secundum dici solum*). A real relation belongs to that which is towards another *simpliciter et absolute*; that is, when its *quidditas* itself is to be related towards another. See Avicenna, *Liber de philosophia prima sive scientia divina*, tract. III, cap. 10 (ed. Van Riet, 179.26–181.69).

³⁴ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. III*, q.4 (52r): “omne accidens in quantum deo attribuitur rationem accidentis inhaerentis amittit et rationem substantiae et subsistentis assumit.”

³⁵ Henry of Ghent, *Summa* 55.6 (111r); *Quodl. III*, q.4 (52r): “Relatio in deo et secundum rem et secundum rationem sui generis cadit in substantiam comparata absolute ad ipsam substantiam; comparata vero ad substantiam in respectu ad suum terminum, et oppositum respectu substantiae, sic manet secundum rationem sui generis.” Also *Quodl. V*, q.2 (154v): “. . . sicut contigit de respectu omnium relationum quae sunt in deo, in quo praedicamentum relationis cum transfertur ad deum, idcirco ratione rei subiectae at accidentalitatis sua quae dicit in creaturis non manet, sed transit in substantiam, et manet solum ratione esse ad aliud. Ita quod esse ad aliud est commune relationi in creaturis et in deo. Sed ex parte realitatis quam contrahit relatio a suo fundamento hic et ibi est tota diversitas.”

³⁶ “Quaternarism” generally refers to the introduction of a fourth reality into the divine Trinity. The term can be traced back to the decree “Damnamus” of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, which aimed at Joachim of Fiore’s understanding of Peter the Lombard’s description of the essence as a *quaedam summa res*. Joachim understood the Lombard to be introducing a fourth reality into God by saying that the essence is a thing which does not participate in the generational acts of the persons. Later scholastics interpreted the Lateran decree as entailing a condemnation of any form of quaternarism, alternatively understood as the positing of an absolute person apart from the three persons, or as the positing of four subsistent relations. For the

theless not necessarily inconsistent with rational truth (*licet intellectus veritati non repugnaret*).³⁷ Henry suggests that we can say that relations are a plurality of distinct things if we qualify it as a plurality of distinct *relative* things, and not simply of distinct *absolute* things.³⁸ In this connection, he considers that Gilbert of Poitier's opinion, whereby relation is a thing extrinsically attached to the divine substance, is "not entirely false" if by "extrinsically attached" we mean that relations are modes or *relative* things as opposed to absolute things. To this extent, Henry believes that there is some truth in the Porretan opinion, especially if we want to safeguard the simplicity of the divine essence. However, and here is where Henry qualifies his allegiance to Gilbert, it is not necessary to reduce relations to "extrinsic attachments" in order to account for their reality. In that case, Henry says, the Porretan position must be discarded.

The fact that Henry should bring Gilbert of Poitiers into the discussion is interesting in itself. Gilbert's metaphysics is greatly influenced by Boethius's Platonism, and encouraged the diffusion of a certain realism of essences which is also manifest in Henry. Following this tradition, Gilbert distinguishes "substance" from "subsistence." A substance is what actually exists under a certain number of accidents, whereas subsistence is the property of that which, in order to be what it is, has no need for accidents. Subsistence makes a thing the sort of thing it is.³⁹ Accordingly, genera and species are subsistences, for taken in themselves they do not need accidents in order to exist. Since substances also do not need accidents in order to subsist, all substances are subsistences, but not all subsistences are substances. Genera and species only subsist but are not substances. Some categories, like substance, quantity, and quality, signify that by which something which is, is; other cate-

decrees's text, see Norman Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. (London and Washington, 1990), 1:231–33.

³⁷ Henry of Ghent, *Summa* 55.6 (111v).

³⁸ Ibid.: "Propter quod [that is, on account of what rational truth dictates] si omnino dicendum sit quod relationes sint diversae et plures res iam dicto modo, videtur mihi quod melius sit dicere cum determinacione, quod sunt plures et diversae res relationis, quam quod sint plures et diversae res re simpliciter accepta. . ." Durandus, as I hope to show, appears to have followed exactly this suggestion.

³⁹ N. M. Häring, ed., *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers* (Toronto, 1966), 135 (*De Trin.* I, 4.99): "Non enim subsistens tantum sed etiam subsistentia appellatur 'substantia' eo quod utraque accidentibus, diuersis tamen rationibus, substant. Subsistens igitur est substantia non qua aliqua rerum est aliquid – nichil enim subsistent est aliquid – sed est illa substantia quae est aliquid. Subsistentia uero est substantia non cui quid nitatur, quo ipsa aliquid sit, sed qua solum subsistens est ALIQUID ID EST est – HOMO VEL est DEUS ut quilibet illorum prenominatorum." Likewise, the categories of quality and quantity are not something (*aliquid*) "just" or "great," but *that by which* something is "just" or "great."

gories do not signify the thing (*res*), but only as it were the circumstances of that which is. The latter Gilbert calls by the comprehensive name of “relative categories,” and unlike the absolute categories, relative predication signifies something extrinsically attached (*extrinsecus affigi*) to the thing. Place, time, and so on contribute minimally to a thing’s being (*minime conferre ut aliquid sint*), even though that to which they are referred has to be something (*aliquid*).⁴⁰ Relatives are not predicated *secundum se*, and only “arrive” from a source different from the thing’s own being (*ex alieno adventu*), that is, they emerge in a comparison with another.⁴¹

Within this frame, it becomes necessary to consider divine relations as something incidental to the divine essence, for otherwise three individual subsistences would be intrinsically added to the divinity with the result (if we believe Boethius’s definition of person) of tritheism. Likewise Henry, sharing the tendency of reducing real things to their intelligible essences, cannot allow modes of being to form part of his ontology as absolute things - hence his half-hearted allowance of “relative things,” if only to safeguard the reality of relations in the divinity. Relation is a thing in the sense that it is a reality, but not in the sense of being a substance.⁴²

3. INTENTIONAL DISTINCTION

Henry defines intentional distinction as an additional type of distinction apart from real and rational distinction. For each type, Henry first clarifies the notions of *res*, *ratio*, and *intentio*. As we have seen, *res* is not an entity of the mind only (*reor*), but whatever is some absolute essence or nature having an exemplar idea in God, whether it be actually existent or only possible, a composite or a principle of composition (as matter and form), universal or particular. In this way, different natures and essences, inasmuch as they signify a real (*secundum rem*) plurality, are really (*re*) distinct. By the same token, two things are identical when they constitute the same thing. Thus, relation is not really distinct from its foundation because it does not introduce another essence apart from that upon which it is founded.⁴³

⁴⁰ Ibid., 137 (*De Trin.* I, 4.109), 139 (*De Trin.*, I, 6.2).

⁴¹ Ibid., 139 (*De Trin.* I, 5.3).

⁴² Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. III*, q.4 (52v): “Et sic relatio habet esse reale, in quantum ipsa quiditas, quae habet unum esse in singularibus et in subiecto, se ipsa habet esse ad aliud, et id quod est res absoluta secundum unum esse, induit rationem respectus secundum aliud esse sive ad aliud esse. Et haec est natura relationum quae sunt relativa secundum esse et per se. . . .”

⁴³ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. V*, q.6 (161r): “Res hic appellatur non figuratum et ens secundum animam tantum, quod dicitur a reor reris, neque respectus aliquis. . . . Unde re differunt

By *ratio*, Henry means a certain mode in which an object presents itself for our cognition so that it could well be presented under another mode. Accordingly, two concepts differ according to reason when, being the same thing and having the same intention, one is conceived in one way and not in another; just as a definition (rational animal) and that which is defined (man) are only two different ways of understanding the same thing.⁴⁴ Henry therefore limits rational distinction to different ways of describing the same thing and the same concept of that thing. He leaves the notion of intentional distinction to cover that slightly stronger distinction which obtains between concepts which signify things.

Intentional distinction obtains between the various *esse essentiae* of a thing. For Henry *intentio* signifies one of the principles which really constitute a simple essence. An intention is capable of being conceived independently of any other principle constitutive of the same essence, and is different from that essence in a way which cannot be said to be real in any proper sense.⁴⁵ In the presence of a real unity, the intellect expresses the nature of that unity in diverse concepts, the contents of which are not overlapped, even though they all reveal something of the same fundamental unity. Henry speaks of intentions in this sense to mean that the intellect *tends towards (intentat)* a determinate note constitutive of the essence, while neglecting all others.⁴⁶ An intentional distinction, therefore, can only occur within what is really the same thing, in the sense that the distinction between the intentions of "rational" and "animal" in man does not imply a dissociation within the same man, but only the potential realization of these intentions in other beings.⁴⁷ Thus, for Henry the notion of intention is not simply logical. Although an intentional plurality is first acknowledged in a concept, it is previously founded on the natures represented by concepts.⁴⁸

quaecunque diversas naturas et essentias important secundum rem. . . . Nullus enim respectus aliquid rei ponit praeter rem eius super quod fundatur."

⁴⁴ Ibid. (161v): "idem re et intentione conceptum diversis modis concipiendi dicit differre secundum rationem in quantum concipitur uno illorum modorum et non alio, sicut patet in conceptione definitionis et definiti, et in diversitate divinorum attributorum."

⁴⁵ Paulus, *Henri de Gand*, 220–21.

⁴⁶ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. V*, q.6 (161r): "Sed appellatur hic intentio aliquid pertinens re aliter ad simplicitatem essentiae alicuius. . . . Unde dicitur intentio quasi intus intentio: eo quod mens conceptu suo in aliquid quod est in re aliqua determinate tendit, et non in aliquid aliud quod est aliquid eiusdem rei."

⁴⁷ Ibid. (161v): "Diversitas intentionum non potest esse nisi inter illa quae uniuntur in eodem secundum rem: ita quod conceptus unius penitus excludit conceptum alterius, et e converso."

⁴⁸ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. IV*, q.4; Paulus, *Henri de Gand*, 222–25.

An intentional distinction consists, then, in the logical non-coincidence of two intentions.⁴⁹ Two different intentions are such that both are founded on the simplicity (and hence do not effect composition) of the same thing (*rei*), deriving from it diverse concepts. The concept of relation, for instance, is distinct from that of its foundation in the sense that relation includes in its definition the notion of its foundation, but not conversely. In this sense, the whole (relation) which includes the other notion (foundation) does not properly constitute an intention and does not in the strict sense differ intentionally from that which forms part of it, but only inasmuch as it includes something other (the term of the relation).⁵⁰

Likewise in the divinity, where the essence accounts for the entire reality of relation, relation includes the intention (*conceptus*) of its foundation and signifies a substance which has a condition towards another. There is only a distinction of reason between relation and the divine essence; for although in God essence and relation are conceived under different *rationes*, both *rationes* belong in reality to the same intention (*conceptus*). Divine relations do not add another intention into God, but only signify a different type of predication (*diversitas secundum rationes praedicamentales*) according to which a different type of name is assigned.⁵¹ Therefore, essence and relations do not differ intentionally but only by reason; that is, according to diverse ways of describing the same intentional and real unity.

4. HENRY'S INFLUENCE IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

There are grounds to think that Henry's teaching on modes exercised some influence upon the Trinitarian doctrines of the early fourteenth-century Dominicans James of Metz and Durandus of St. Pourçain.⁵² It is a common trait

⁴⁹ Henry of Ghent, *Summa* 28.4, 7; *Quodl. III*, q.9; *Quodl. I*, q.9.

⁵⁰ Henry of Ghent, *Quodl. V*, q.6 (161v): "conceptus respectus sicut entis [includit] conceptum essentiae, non e converso . . . id quod alterum continet non differt intentione ab illo quod ab eo continetur, nisi ratione alterius partis contente in significato eiusdem . . . ipsum totum quod alterum continet non proprie dicitur intentio, neque proprie dicitur differre intentione ab eo quod est sicut pars eius. . . ."

⁵¹ *Ibid.* (163r): "In deo enim fundatur respectus super ipsam divinam essentiam non secundum aliam rationem esse quam illam quae est essentiae ut es essentia. Et ideo secundum illam cadit in significazione relationis, ut paternitatis et filiationis, licet secundum aliam proprietatem impositionis nominis, absque omni diversitate intentionum. Sed est solum inter essentiam, ut est essentia, et ut induit rationem relationis, diversitas secundum rationes praedicamentales secundum quas nomina imponuntur."

⁵² Paulus, *Henri de Gand*, 187.

in modern accounts⁵³ to isolate Durandus as the only member of the Dominican order in the early fourteenth century who incorporated to his theology sources alien to Thomism. This account has found support in the fact that Durandus's insights, above those of any other Dominican of his time, brought perennial controversy.⁵⁴ However, precisely the fact that Dominican authorities felt compelled to exert repeated pressure against "novel opinions" suggests that there was a greater degree of opposition from within the order's lines. In this respect, Joseph Koch⁵⁵ has suggested that Durandus's innovations are not disconnected from the fact that he received instruction from the Dominican James of Metz, who was himself what Koch calls a "critical Thomist" (*kritische Thomiste*).⁵⁶

An examination of James's Trinitarian account will enable a better assessment of the value of Koch's thesis of a doctrinal line originating in Henry and flowing consistently through James to Durandus. For Durandus's deviation was not only unwelcome in a context of Thomistic "orthodoxy," but, as his interpretation of Henry will show, Durandus represented a doctrinal defiance to the "common opinion" of his day and the principles of Aristotelian philosophy that it presupposed.

James inherited from Henry the threefold classification of modes of being into being in itself, being in another, and being towards another; the identification of relation with a pure mode of being which does not effect composition with its foundation; and the understanding of the Trinity in the light of this notion of relation.⁵⁷ James states that there are two senses in which accidents can inhere in another (*in alio*). One sense applies to absolute accidents, whereby they inhere *in* a subject. Another sense applies to relative accidents,

⁵³ See for example D. Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* (London, 1962), 315–16; E. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy*, 473–76; W. A. Hinnebusch, *The History of the Dominican Order in the Middle Ages*, vol. 2 (New York, 1966), 156–61.

⁵⁴ For a full account of the controversy between Durandus and his order, see J. Koch, *Durandus de S. Porciano*. For the text of the 1314 censure list, see J. Koch, ed., "Articuli nonaginta tres extracti ex Durandi de S. Porciano O.P. primo scripto super Sententia et examinati per magistros et baccalarios Ordinis," in *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1973), 54–57. See in particular articles 5, 6, and 13, concerning Durandus's Trinitarian teaching.

⁵⁵ Koch, *Jakob von Metz*, 193–94.

⁵⁶ Koch suggests that this line of "critical Thomism" can be traced back to Aquinas's disciple, Peter of Auvergne; see *ibid.*, 193. For a complete account on Peter's life and works, see J. V. Le Clerc, "Pierre d'Auvergne. Chanoine de Notre-Dame et Recteur de l'Université de Paris," *Histoire littéraire de la France* 25 (Paris, 1869).

⁵⁷ Paulus, *Henri de Gand*, 187. See James of Metz, (A) *I Sent.* d.26 q.3 (Troyes 992, fol. 55ra). For a full account of James's teaching on Trinitarian relations, see B. Decker, *Die Gotteslehre des Jakob von Metz: Untersuchungen zur Dominikanertheologie zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts*, ed. R. Haubst in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* 42/1 (Münster, 1967), 438–60.

according to which they establish an order of their foundation towards another. James understands the *esse in alio* of relation in this second sense, as a pure order of its foundation towards another. Therefore, relation is in its foundation not as in a subject but as in that on which it depends, that is, *fundamentaliter*.⁵⁸

In denying the inherent character of the *esse* of relation James is no doubt following Henry.⁵⁹ The underlying insight is that modes of being, unlike absolute accidents, *depend* on their foundation rather than *inhere* in their subject. Hence the customary corollary of non-composition which both Henry and James are keen on asserting, especially when it comes to the divinity. Thus, for James, divine relation simply signifies a distinct mode of “referring” the divine essence (*diversus modus se habendi*).⁶⁰ This is not to imply, however, that God is a composite of essence and relation, for, as a mode of being, relation is metaphysically incapable of adding anything to its foundation. Relation is not a *res* added to the divine substance, even though it has sufficient reality of itself to constitute a different category from substance.⁶¹

James argues that in the divinity real distinction obtains only in virtue of the order of origin whereby one person is distinguished from the other. Relations are not distinct from the divine essence, to which they are not related by origin, but rather constitute the same divine reality.⁶² Thus, James adopts Henry’s doctrine of modes to explain distinction in the divinity in a way that respects Henry’s intention: that is, essence and relation are distinct only according to reason, so that there is no real distinction in the divinity beyond personal distinction.

Durandus’s account on Trinitarian relations follows in general that of James’s. Both believe that essence and relation are distinct according to a *modus se habendi*, that is to say, in a way that does not entail composition.⁶³ However, where Durandus departs from James, and for that matter from Henry, is in the way he understands the type of distinction which obtains between modes and absolute things.

⁵⁸ James of Metz, (A) *I Sent.* d.26 q.1 (Troyes 992, fol. 55ra–b).

⁵⁹ The distinction between subject and foundation regarding relation thus constitutes a sharpened approach to the issue initially proposed by Henry of Ghent; see *Quodl. IX*, q.3 (ed. Macken, 85.14–86.62); *Summa* 32.5 (199, 203); *Quodlibet III*, 4 (52); *Quodl. IV*, q.3 (354); *Quodl. V*, q.2.

⁶⁰ James of Metz, (A) *I Sent.* d.33 q.1 a.3 (Troyes 992, fol. 57vb–58ra).

⁶¹ Ibid. (fol. 57va–b): “relatio differt realiter ab essentia eo modo quo sufficit realitas ad distinctionem praedicamentorum.”

⁶² Ibid. (fol. 58ra).

⁶³ Durandus, (A) *I Sent.* d.33 q.1 (Paris, BnF lat. 14454, fol. 84ra).

According to Durandus, two things are really identical only when they have the same mode of being. A mode of being is not a fully actual thing, but is essentially and formally *of* a thing, so that its entire reality consists in being *of* a thing (*huius*).⁶⁴ Unlike substances and absolute accidents, which are fully actual things possessing a mode, the entire reality of relation consists in its mode of being towards another. Thus, unlike absolute things, the *ratio* of relation is its whole reality as a pure mode of being.⁶⁵ Note, however, that by identifying the *ratio* of relation with its reality as a mode of being Durandus was just ostensibly following Henry's metaphysics. Durandus was in fact interpreting it according to a stronger realist line which would not have been necessarily sanctioned by Henry.

For Durandus, then, the term connoted by relation is formally included in its definition, on account of which relation must be really distinct from its foundation, which does not formally connote another term.⁶⁶ Likewise in the divinity, paternity formally includes a reference to filiation, whereas the essence of itself does not. Consequently, essence and paternity are not absolutely and entirely (*omnino de se*) the same thing (*res*), but are somehow really distinct (*differunt aliquo modo realiter*).⁶⁷ Thus, what for James was a qualified type of identity, for Durandus is a type of distinction.

⁶⁴ See Durandus, *Quodl. Aven. I*, q.1, pp.47–49: “Respectus, autem, et omnes modi essendi, sunt entia quia entis, non solum concomitative, sed etiam quidditative et formaliter, qui nullam entitatem habent, nisi eam quae est huius [. . .].” Durandus's Avignon quodlibets were composed between Advent 1314 and Advent 1316, and have been edited by P. T. Stella, *Magistri Durandi a Sancto Porciano O.P. Quolibeta Avenionensis Tria. Additis Correctionibus Hersei Natalis supra dicta Durandi in primo quolibet Textus et Studia in Historiam Scholasticae* (Zürich, 1965).

⁶⁵ Durandus, (A) *I Sent.* d.33 q.1 (Paris, BnF lat. 14454, fol. 84ra). Cf. Henry of Ghent, *Summa* 55.6 (111r); *Quodl. LX*, q.3 (see n. 1 above). Durandus certainly followed the last suggestion and extended his ontology to include modes of being.

⁶⁶ Durandus, (A) *I Sent.* d.33 q.1 (Paris, BnF lat. 14454, fol. 84ra): “relatio est alia res a suo fundamento et tamen non facit compositionem. Primum patet . . . nos distinguimus in realitatem triplex modus essendi, scilicet essendi in se vel per se, essendi in alio, et essendi ad aliud. Primus modus convenit substantiis completis, secundus convenit omnibus formis, tertius convenit omnibus relationis. Et ex hoc sic arguitur sic se habent modi essendi in se et in alio ad ea in quibus fundatur. Ergo similiter modus essendi ad aliud qui est ipse respectus. Relatus differt realiter a suo fundamento. Major patet de se. Minor patet sic. Illa quae sic se habent quod unita possunt separari, sic quod unum maneatin integritate nec sue sive alio differunt realiter. Si tamen unum sit res sed esse in se vel per se, et ea in quibus hoc fundantur sunt huius fundantur in modus essendi in se vel per se in substantia completa et modus essendi in alio in forma [inhaerente]. Sed hoc ab invice separantur sic humana natura in Christo non per se existit [i.e., subsistit] in sacramento vero existit in alio saltem quantitas. Ergo talis modi essendi differunt realiter ab hiis in quibus fundantur.”

⁶⁷ Ibid. (fols. 83vb–84ra): “illa autem non sunt eadem res adaequate et convertibiliter qui est quidam modus realiter idem non sunt omnino idem realiter . . . [84ra] essentia et paternitas

This is not to mean that for Durandus essence and relation form a composite unity. For Durandus believes that composition only obtains when one absolute thing inheres in another absolute thing.⁶⁸ Relation, however, is only a mode of being and is thereby incapable of producing any changes in its foundation.⁶⁹ Underlying this thesis is Durandus's belief that, more fundamental than a division into substances and accidents, reality is divided into absolute and relative.⁷⁰ "Thing" (*res*), Durandus maintains, is understood equivocally of absolute and relative, but primarily (*per prius*) of absolute and secondarily (*per posterior*) of relative.⁷¹ Relation is in that sense a thing *secundum quid*, by which Durandus means that relation is a mode of being with a diminished reality in comparison with fully actual things.⁷² It is therefore on account of its diminished ontological status that relation fails to effect composition with its foundation.

non sunt eadem res adaequate et convertibiliter. Sequitur quod non sunt omnibus modis idem realiter. Sed quae non sunt omnibus modis idem realiter differunt aliquo modo realiter. Ergo paternitas et essentia differunt realiter."

⁶⁸ Durandus (A) *I Sent.* d.33 q.1 (Paris, BnF lat. 14454, fol. 84rb): "res dicitur analogice de absoluto et de relativo, sed per prius et simpliciter de absoluto, per posterior autem de relativo secundum quid . . . quaelibet est absoluta facit compositionem cum re absoluta, sed id quod dicuntur res . . . secundum quid . . . nullo modo facit compositionem cum absoluto nec cum relativo." Cf. (C) *I Sent.* d.30 q.2 (Venice, 1571 [Gregg Press 1964 reprint], fol. 84vb).

⁶⁹ Durandus, (A) *I Sent.* d.13 q.1 (Paris, BnF lat. 14454, fol. 54vb): ". . . subsistere et inhaerere solum absolutis convenient, relatio enim qua est modo essendi ad aliud et quicumque modus essendi sive in se sive in alio non subsistit per se nec inhaeret fundamento suo eo quod non est res absoluta a suo fundamento distincta pluralitas. Ergo respectu relationum in eodem supposito nullo modo est pluralitas subsistente suppositorum nec eorum per qua supposita divina subsistent. . . ."

⁷⁰ Cf. Aquinas, *In Metaphysicam Aristotelis Commentaria* 5.9 n. 885 (Turin, 1935): ". . . primo distinguit ens in ens per se et per accidens. . . . Divisio entis secundum se et secundum accidens, attenditur secundum quod aliquid praedicatur de aliquo per se vel per accidens. Divisio vero entis in substantia et accidens attenditur secundum hoc quod aliquid in natura sua est vel substantia vel accidens."

⁷¹ For Durandus's understanding of univocity, see *Quodl. Aven. III*, q.1 a.3 (ed. Stella, 230–49). A univocal name, according to Durandus, is predicated of a plurality of things according to a common *ratio*, that is, quidditatively. Thus, Durandus admits essential univocity only regarding absolute things in respect to one another. See also *Quodl. Aven. I*, q.1 (ed. Stella, 47–49).

⁷² This passage amounts to Durandus's initial *credo* on relations as modes of being. See Durandus, (A) *I Sent.* d.33 q.1 (Paris, BnF lat. 14454, fol. 84rb–va): "Ista opinio si esset veram evitaret multas difficultates circa distinctionem personarum; nihilominus tamen illud quod est manifestus in ea scilicet quod diverse res non faciunt compositionem non omnino videtur efficaciter probatum." Considering the circumstances under which recension A was disseminated (prematurely stolen by some "curiosi"), one wonders whether these lines were meant as a personal, provisional note that Durandus was making to himself as a reminder for deeper consideration of the matter. Cf. (C) *I Sent.* d.30 q.2 (fol. 84vb).

Durandus's metaphysical division also entails that one and the same thing cannot be simultaneously absolute and relative. Note the contrast with Henry, for whom one and the same thing can be simultaneously absolute and relative, because the *esse ad aliud* of relation signifies only a reference towards another and not a different reality.

* * *

Durandus's thesis of a real distinction between essence and relation derived, in principle, from an interpretation of Henry's modal doctrine. Like James, Durandus also identifies relation with a mode of being and resorts to a metaphysics of modes in order to explain the reality of the Trinity. In the light of the previous examination, however, Joseph Koch's view⁷³ of an essential connection of Durandus's position with that of Henry and James, stands in need of revision. What mainly separated Durandus's account from that of Henry and James was the attribution of an ontological value to modes of being in their own right, which inevitably led to a heterodox explanation of distinction in the divinity. By contrast, Henry and James's rejection of a real distinction responded to an understanding of modes as of themselves lacking all reality, as being mere *rationes*.

In this respect, James followed Henry's intention more closely than Durandus, for both Henry and James ultimately complied with the Aristotelian division into substances and accidents. According to this division, whatever is not a substance is an accident and necessarily inheres and effects composition. Thus, Henry and James were never prepared to establish a real distinction between modes of being and their foundation, lest it effected composition and jeopardized divine simplicity. In this vein, Henry explicitly pronounced against a real distinction between essence and relation and instead proposed a distinction of reason.⁷⁴ Likewise, James reduced real distinction to the relations between the persons, and restricted the notion of modes to the connection between essence and relations.

Durandus came from a different direction, and his use of the modal doctrine rather responded to theological motives. Durandus resorted to Henry's metaphysics of modes with the double purpose of asserting a real distinction while

⁷³ See Koch, *Jakob von Metz*, 208.

⁷⁴ See Henry, see mainly *Quodl. III*, q.4 (52r), and *Quodl. V*, q.6 (161v, 162v, 163r). Note also that for Henry in the divinity there is no other intention apart from that of the essence. Relation does not signify a different intention in the divinity, whereby essence and relation cannot stand in an intentional distinction. Durandus, by contrast, sees in divine relations an intention distinct from the essence's.

checking the risk of composition. Thus, Henry's doctrine fitted Durandus's theological agenda in that it provided the appropriate metaphysical tools to build a strong Trinitarian theology which was as far from the risk of Sabellianism⁷⁵ as it was from the risk of composition.

Indicative of Durandus's theological priorities is the fact that he was always prepared to forfeit Aristotelian philosophy for the sake of a coherent account of the Trinity. His understanding of reality as primarily divided into absolute and relative, together with his attribution of an ontological value to relation, amounted to a rather heterodox reading of Aristotelian metaphysics. In this light, Durandus's *opinio singularis* signified a challenge not only to Henry's metaphysics, but with it to the doctrinal consensus of his day. For all of Henry's participation in the 1277 condemnation, his unequivocal rejection of any autonomous reality in relation, backed by a sound Aristotelian metaphysics of substances and accidents, ultimately placed him closer to the "common opinion" than to Durandus.

Linacre College, Oxford University.

⁷⁵ "Sabellianism," thus named after Sabellius (early third-century theologian), refers to the modalist form of Monarchianism, according to which in the Godhead the only differentiation is a mere succession of modes or operations. That Durandus was particularly repelled by Sabellianism, we know from his so-called *confessio*, allegedly a report he is said to have sent to the Carmelite Guido Terreni, approximately a year before the 1314 censure list: "est condemnata heres Sabelliana . . . , per simbolum Nicenum, . . . et per documentum Athanasii et per Innocentium in . . . 'Firmiter' et 'Dampniamus' . . ." For an extract of this document, see J. Koch, *Durandus de S. Porciano*, 107 n. 6, quoted from Guido Terreni, *Quodl. I* (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Borges. 39).

PARIS, BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DE FRANCE
LAT. 16483:
CONTENTS, AUDIENCE, AND
THE MATTER OF OLD FRENCH*

Christopher J. McDonough

IN a long article dedicated to establishing the canon of a certain Gérard of Liège, André Wilmart found little to interest him in the contents of the sermons preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 16483, which he labelled as “brouillons” and “esquisses informes.”¹ Despite his general indifference, he was sufficiently puzzled by the farrago of Latin and French to recommend further study of the phenomenon.² This article is a response to Wilmart’s suggestion and its principal purpose is to provide an alphabetic inventory of the vernacular words and phrases that are sprinkled throughout the seventy predominantly Latin sermons, with each item presented briefly within its Latin context.³ The article also attempts to articulate an historical context for assessing the sociolinguistic importance of the French stratum.

* It is a pleasure to record the generous assistance of Professor Nicole Bériou, who offered several constructive comments on the contents of Paris, BnF lat. 16483. I also warmly thank two colleagues, Lawrence Kerslake and Brian Merrilees, Department of French, University of Toronto, who with equal generosity made themselves freely available for consultation on many problematic passages of Old French. They are not responsible for any errors that remain. My gratitude also to an anonymous reader for *Mediaeval Studies* for advice on the formal aspects of the paper as well as for useful suggestions for tightening the argument.

¹ André Wilmart, “Gérard de Liège. Un traité inédit de l’Amour de Dieu,” *Revue d’ascétique et de mystique* 12 (1931): 349–430 at 378–79. The sermons in Paris, BnF lat. 16483 will be accompanied by the number assigned to them in Johannes Baptist Schneyer, *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150–1350*, vol. 2, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters* 43/2 (Münster Westfalen, 1970), 173–78 (hereafter JBS). The sermons are more or less developed and vary in length; for example, the first, *Deus autem patientie* (JBS 1), assembles material for a sermon (fols. 7ra–8ra) and then appends a much lengthier collation on the same theme (fols. 8ra–11rb). By contrast, the sermons *Omnis uallis implebitur* (fol. 19va–b; JBS 7) and *Ecce uirgo concipiet* (fols. 19vb–20rb; JBS 8) are extremely brief, while *Ecce mulier Chananea* (fols. 52rb–53vb; JBS 29) lacks the numerous subdivisions that underpin many other resumés in the collection.

² Wilmart, “Gérard de Liège,” 384; on p. 372 he describes it as “une étrange farce.”

³ I do not include separate entries for the direct and indirect article, conjunctions, pronouns, and prepositions.

The problem of language and the debate about bilingualism in medieval sermons are inseparable from broader questions concerning the authorship, public, and social function of the sermons in Paris, BnF lat. 16483.⁴

The old view, argued by A. Lecoy de la Marche in the nineteenth century, held that medieval sermons were delivered to two distinct audiences in two different languages.⁵ Sermons were preached to the laity in the vernacular, but were normally recorded in Latin, while Latin was used for presenting homilies to clerics, religious, and scholars.⁶ Lecoy de la March rejected arguments advanced by B. Hauréau that sermons were preached in a mixture of languages.⁷ In light of this debate, it will be essential to examine the sermons in Paris, BnF lat. 16483 for any internal evidence, social, pastoral or religious, regarding the status or class of the audience. The interplay between the languages is notable for several reasons. The passage from Latin to French occurs most intensely in the domain of scriptural authorities. Through various means, including translation, glossing, paraphrase, and commentary, French is engaged repeatedly to convey the Christian message of these biblical citations. This attempt by the vernacular to mediate the letter and spirit of scriptural verses provides a small window onto the broader energies at work in thirteenth-century society that aimed to make the Bible available to the French-speaking public in their own language. In addition to communicating the word of God, written French is often the medium of choice for recording the proverbial and other popular expressions that formed part of the preacher's rhetoric. Moreover, the vernacular supplies numerous images, metaphors, and vocabulary that derive from other discourses, including legal,

⁴ For the issues surrounding this aspect of popular sermons delivered by friars, see D. L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford, 1985), 90–95; and Michel Zink, *La prédication en langue romane avant 1300* (Paris, 1976), 94.

⁵ Giles Constable, "The Language of Preaching in the Twelfth Century," *Viator* 25 (1994): 131–52, reviews evidence that points to a much more complex situation than this view suggests.

⁶ On the various possibilities by which notes taken down in the vernacular could be put into Latin, see L.-J. Bataillon, "Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons," *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s., 11 (1980): 19–35 at 22–23. Constable, "Language of Preaching," 135–36, summarizes the steps involved in the transmission of sermon texts.

⁷ See A. Lecoy de la Marche, *La chaire française au moyen âge spécialement au XIII^e siècle* (Paris 1886); in assembling evidence for his case, he notes two bilingual passages from Paris, BnF lat. 16483 (p. 256 and n. 2, p. 257 n. 2), and on pp. 259–69 he sets out the arguments in favour of his rule. For criticism of parts of Lecoy's thesis, see Siegfried Wenzel, *Macaronic Sermons, Bilingualism and Preaching in Late-Medieval England* (Ann Arbor, 1994), 107, 114–16; and Constable, "Language of Preaching," 132–33. R. W. Hunt, *The Schools and the Cloister: The Life and Writings of Alexander Nequam (1157–1217)*, edited and revised by Margaret Gibson (Oxford, 1984), 92–94, concluded that Lecoy's position was expressed "too absolutely" in light of evidence that Alexander, who preached to mixed audiences of *scolares* and laymen, may have addressed one section of a sermon directed to the *laici* in the vernacular.

administrative, and medical ones. Taken together, they provide a lively sense of contemporary culture and some of the social structures that underlay it. The French material may also prove useful to lexicographers and philologists interested in the historical development of French and the relation between medieval Latin and vernacular syntactical usage. On a more microscopic level, the orthography and morphology of the French may contain particularities which can be identified by specialists in Old French as having originated from a certain region, a discovery that could assist the search for the author or the scribe of the collection as a whole.⁸

The introduction to the wordlist begins with a description of the manuscript, followed by the available evidence for dating the collection. Dating the sermons is important not least because it provides an additional coordinate for fixing the limits within which to search for their composers. The nature of the source material examined in this section entails a brief discussion of the issue of authorship. Next, the form and contents of the bilingual sermons will be analyzed. Were they private works, intended for solitary, devotional reading, or were they directed at public audiences, lay as well as clerical? What external and internal evidence does the manuscript contain that could mark the nature and purpose of the collection as monastic or non-monastic? The introduction continues with a rough taxonomy of vernacular usage, which reveals a pattern of French subordinated within the larger frame of Latin texts. It concludes with some general observations about the kinds of mixed audiences for which sermons in macaronic form might have been reused.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Paris, BnF lat. 16483, parchment, is a thirteenth-century volume,⁹ comprising 111 leaves, bound in wooden covers which have at the right edge two in-

⁸ Bataillon, "Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons," 23, observes that in the sermons of Pierre de Limoges, the French is Occitan and thus the language of the reporter, not of the preacher. The problem of authorship deserves a separate study. Here I present only preliminary findings. In a ground-breaking article, L.-J. Bataillon and N. Bériou, "'G. de Mailly' de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs," *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 61 (1991): 5–88 at 19–22, discovered that two sermons in Paris, BnF lat. 16483 for Holy Thursday contain material from sermon 30 of the *Abiciamus* for the same liturgical feast. If, as they propose, the author of the two model collections, the *Abiciamus* and the *Suspendium*, was named Gérard, and not Guillaume, of Mailly, they ask whether he with Gérard of Liège may be one and the same. In the absence of evidence that Gérard of Mailly was ever in Liège, and because the manuscript tradition of the *Abiciamus* indicates its popularity, it is a reasonable inference that the author of Paris, BnF lat. 16483, like Ranulphe de la Houblonnière, consulted it for the plan and development of many of his own sermons.

⁹ Léopold Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits de la Sorbonne* (Paris, 1870), 61; Wilmart,

dented squares, where once there were hinges. Leaves of 260×172 mm. contain a writing area of 170×110 mm., ruled with four vertical lines that form boxes for two columns, each 50 mm. across with a 10 mm. space in between them. The number of lines per page varies; for example, fol. 7r has 35 lines, fol. 15r has 36, fol. 71r has 39, fol. 81r has 42, fol. 92r has 46, fol. 98r has 44, fol. 100r has 46, and fol. 105r has 45. The collation of leaves is 1⁶ 2–13⁸ 14⁶ + iii. There are catchwords at the bottom right hand corner in the scribe's hand on fols. 14v, 22v, 30v, 38v, 46v, 53v, 61v, 77v, 85v, 93v, and 101v. The foliation is consecutive, with two successive folios at 51, the second of which is marked as 51 bis. All quires are numbered consecutively from i to xiii. The first folio contains "Sorb. 1663" at the top of the recto, under which is recorded in the same seventeenth-century hand "Ce Ms. de 13e siècle contient les sermons du frère Gerard de liege." Below this in a nineteenth-century hand is recorded the number of leaves in the book, with the date appended: "20 septembre 1869." On the same leaf are found the former numbers of the manuscript: 961 (crossed out) and 923.

At the top of fol. 3r, written in a brown ink different from the black ink of the text, there is a thirteenth-century colophon: "Sermones sunt Hic fratri Gerard De liege Le diuin."¹⁰ On fols. 3ra–6ra the scribe helpfully recorded a contents list of the sermons in the order in which they appear in the manuscript. The sermons are identified by the incipit, which sometimes contains minor variations from that of the preaching text, followed by subheadings, generally in the form in which they are found in the margin of the folios in the text. The location of each is noted by a reference to the quaternion and folio (recto or verso) and the page, first or second. Thus, for example, the third sermon (*Ecce rex tuus uenit* [Mt 21:5], fols. 13vb–14va; JBS 3)¹¹ is summarized in the contents table as follows (fol. 3ra):

Ecce rex tuus uenit etc. primo quaterno
septimo folio eiusdem quaterni secunda
pagina septimi folii.

Tria fiunt in homagio scilicet iuramentum fidelitatis, accessus ad osculum et presentatio alicuius exennii. primo quaterno septimo folio eiusdem quaterni secunda pagina septimi folii.

"Gérard de Liège," 378 n. 72, placed it in the second half of the thirteenth century. Short extracts from Paris, BnF lat. 16483, fols. 29va and 76rb, are cited by B. Hauréau, *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 6 vols (Paris, 1890–93), 4:25, 30. The sermon *Ecce rex tuus uenit* (fols. 13vb–14va; JBS 3) appears as one of the sources assembled by Jean Leclercq, "Le sermon sur la royauté du Christ au moyen âge," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littérature du moyen âge* 14 (1943–45): 143–80 at 150, no. 13.

¹⁰ Wilmart, "Gérard de Liège," 378; Bataillon and Bériou, "'G. de Mailly,'" 19, explain that the epithet refers to a master who taught Scripture; cf. *ibid.*, 20 n. 3.

¹¹ Extracts from this sermon are printed by Leclercq, "Le sermon sur la royauté du Christ,"

Fol. 6rb bears the stamp of the Bibliothèque Imperiale, with fol. 6v left empty. The sermon texts are copied out on fols. 7ra–107ra, with fol. 107rb left blank. Fols. 108ra–110rb were added to the original volume, as the different parchment attests, and contains in a fourteenth-century hand a sermon set out in two columns with the incipit “Karissimi, estote prudentes et uigilate in orationibus.” Fol. 111r consists of paper which has been pasted onto the wooden board and bears the following late thirteenth-century *ex libris*: “Iste liber est pauperum magistrorum de Sorbona precii xx sol.” This epigraph establishes that it belonged to the masters of the Sorbonne, though unfortunately it provides no information about its previous owner.¹² In their hands it remained until its transfer in the nineteenth century to the Bibliothèque Imperiale.

The sermons recorded on fols. 7ra–107ra are the work of a single scribe. His corrections, deletions, and marginal additions attest to the consistent care of the copying. There are occasional lacunae in the text, the result, perhaps, of the scribe’s inability to decipher his exemplar. The initial of the sermon’s first word is capitalized and modestly illuminated in blue and red, with the decoration occasionally extending down the space which separates the two columns of writing. Red ink is sometimes used to underline scriptural quotations or to encase the marginal subheadings to the sermons. Hands, with a finger pointing to a passage of the text, are drawn on fols. 16va, 33r–v, 34r, 36v, 38v, 39r, 44v, 66r, 84r, and 95r. Rubrics are now and then added by the copyist to denote the season or festival (e.g., fol. 7ra, *Dominica prima aduentus sermo*; fol. 14va, *Dominica secunda aduentus*) or the subject of the sermon. On one occasion the contents of the sermon are summarized in a schematic table (fol. 27v). Equally rare are the marginal glosses which are attached to three words from Juvenal 8.1–2 (fol. 55rb, “*Stemata*] idest nobilitatis generis”; “*faciunt*] idest ualent”; “*Pontice*] proprium nomen est”) and the word *conca* (fol. 81rb, “*pisciculus* est”). At some stage of their transmission the sermons were edited. The numerous cross-references in the body of the texts show that they had been revised. Many involve long distance cross-references to passages in earlier or later sermons; thus, fol. 9vb directs the reader to a passage found on fol. 65rb,¹³ while a reference on fol. 95va looks back to an item on fol. 86ra.¹⁴

164; for the popularity of this theme, see also p. 175; on pp. 177–80 he edits two anonymous thirteenth-century sermons with the theme *Ecce rex tuus venit tibi mansuetus*.

¹² Léopold Delisle does not mention Paris, BnF lat. 16483 in *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1868–81), 2:142–200 (on the library of the Sorbonne).

¹³ Fol. 9vb, “Requie hoc in sermone *Beatus uir qui inuenit* etc. primo membro,” a reference to a passage on fol. 65rb (JBS 39). Other references are less precise, e.g., fol. 20rb, “Inspice quomodo nouo regi occurendum est; de feodo releuando et homagio renouando, sicut alibi,” a reference to a passage located on fol. 13vb (*Ecce tuus rex uenit*; JBS 3).

¹⁴ Fol. 95va, “Nota hic de inuentione super illud apostoli *eterna redempzione inuenta* [Hebr

There are also directions to sermons that have not been gathered in the collection.¹⁵

A fourteenth-century hand left traces of his presence by adding rubrics (e.g., fol. 31rb, *Dominica prima aduentus in carnem*), comments in French and Latin on matters of interest to him in the text (e.g., fol. 23v), glosses on the preaching text (e.g., fol. 19v), and, very rarely, corrections to the text (fols. 24va–b). It is in the hand of this scribe that the attribution of particular sermons is made to Gérard of Liège on fol. 94r (*Sermo in cena domini fratris Gerardi de liege—Sciens Ihesus*; JBS 63) and to Jean d'Abbeville, the regent of the University of Paris ca. 1217 and cardinal in 1227, on fol. 102r (*Sermo in cena magistri Iohannis de abbeuilla—Afferam paxillum*; JBS 69).¹⁶ However, the thirteenth-century colophon on fol. 3r, noted above, claims the sermons for brother Gérard of Liège “le devin.” Yet the formulation of the notice is such that it could be interpreted to mean “There are here some sermons of Gérard of Liège,” implying that not all of them are from his pen. Whatever importance is attached to it, it must be noted that the colophon is written in the same (second) hand as the two marginal notes that assign the sermons already mentioned to Gérard and Jean d'Abbeville.

The collection appears to be ordered in a general way according to the liturgical cycle, with several sermons assembled in groups for certain feasts or periods of the Church year.¹⁷ Thus the first twelve sermons are devoted to the

9:12] et hoc in fine illius sermonis *Christus assistens pontifex etc.*,” a reference to a passage on fol. 86ra (JBS 56); see also fol. 101vb, “Nota de quinque expositionibus finis, sicut alibi in illo sermone *Sciens Ihesus etc.*,” a reference to a passage found on fol. 94ra–b (JBS 63).

¹⁵ E.g., fol. 9va, “Expone sicut in illo sermone *Ponam uisitationem* etc. *iiii^o membro*”; on fol. 45ra, *Exi cito in uicos* (JBS 24), the preacher or reporter appears to allude to an earlier sermon that has not been included: “In euangelio precedentis dominice auaritia et inurbanitas diuitias mendacis quem abhominatur Salomon . . .”; the reference suggests there was probably a longer collection, from which *Exi cito in uicos* was drawn.

¹⁶ Wilmart, “Gérard de Liège,” 379 n. 79. The sermons of this prolific preacher are listed in Schneyer, *Repertorium*, vol. 3 (Münster Westfalen, 1971), 510–66. The attribution of the sermon *Afferam paxillum* by the second hand to Jean is duly noted by Schneyer on p. 539. On the widespread diffusion of his sermons by means of the *pecia* system, see Nicole Bériou, “Les sermons latins après 1200,” in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle, *Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental* 81–83 (Turnhout, 2000), 363–447 at 407–8. Most of his sermons remain unedited, but the *Sermones in Psalms* have been published (Bologna, 1757); cf. André Callebaut, “Les sermons sur les Psaumes, imprimés sous le nom de S. Antoine, restitués au cardinal Jean d'Abbeville,” *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 25 (1932): 161–74. I have not been able to consult the 1757 edition in order to compare the style of the sermon *Afferam paxillum* and determine whether there are grounds, formal or otherwise, for accepting it as Jean's. However, the inclusion in *Afferam paxillum* of several elements from a sermon of Gérard of Mailly, whose two model collections were in circulation not before 1273 (cf. Bériou, “Les sermons latins après 1200,” 406), makes the attribution to Jean untenable on chronological grounds.

¹⁷ Bataillon, “Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons,” 20, observes that, of the

season of Advent, followed by two sermons on the Passion.¹⁸ The sermons on fols. 54rb–57ra (JBS 31–34) are meditations on the birth of the Virgin. The fourth sermon refers (fol. 16ra) to the sermon *Expecta dominum* (fols. 91vb–94ra; JBS 62) as a text to be delivered *feria tertia ante ramos palmarum*.

DATING AND AUTHORSHIP

Internally the sermons offer few concrete details that could help to establish a precise date for them in the thirteenth century. One item of evidence is implicit in the system of biblical quotation which was based on the number of the chapter, followed by letters from *a* to *g*, which divided it into seven parts, e.g., “Ysa xixg” [Is 19:22] on fol. 7rb and “Iere iig” [Jer 2:32] on fol. 12vb.¹⁹ Though this notational system is used only occasionally, its sporadic appearance proves that many sermons were written after the introduction of this schema, which appeared with the publication of the first biblical concordance by Hugh of St. Cher, and was complete by ca. 1236.²⁰ The second edition, which supplied a full context for each word cited, probably appeared around mid-century.²¹

The numerous authorities and sources scattered throughout the collection, although important in their own right,²² contain few firm chronological indi-

several kinds, the liturgically ordered collections were the most practical.

¹⁸ For a division of sermons into the categories *de tempore* and *de sanctis* and the representation of a liturgical event by more than one sermon in collections, see Bériou, “Les sermons latins après 1200,” 387–89.

¹⁹ Cf. R. H. and M. A. Rouse, “The Verbal Concordance to the Scriptures,” *Archivum fratum praedicatorum* 44 (1974): 5–30 at 10.

²⁰ Ibid., 8; Robert E. Lerner, “Poverty, Preaching, and Eschatology in the Revelation Commentaries of ‘Hugh of St. Cher,’ ” in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*, ed. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood, Studies in Church History Subsidia 4 (Oxford, 1985), 157–89 at 182 n. 65.

²¹ See Rouse, “Verbal Concordance,” 13.

²² In the seventy sermons, the number of citations attributed by name, correctly or not, to ancient, patristic and medieval sources is as follows: Ambrose (three), Augustine (twenty-two, including one misattribution to St. Bernard), Bede (one), Bernard of Clairvaux (twenty-six, including one assigned to Hugh of St. Victor, another to Augustine; the two excerpts from William of St. Thierry’s *Epistola* 1.4 [PL 184:313B–D] are titled “Bernardus ad Cartusienses”), Boethius (four), Cassiodorus (one), Crisostomus (eight), Dionysius (two), Gilbert of Hoyland (one), Gregory (nine, with one citation misattributed to Augustine), Haymo (one), Horace (one), Isidore (one), Jerome (five), Juvenal (two, with one attributed to Horace), Matthew of Vendôme (one), Ovid (three, one introduced by the heading “poeta,” another given to Boethius), Peter of Ravenna (two), Seneca (ten), Walther of Châtillon (one). In addition there are fourteen citations identified only by “glossa”; nine of these are from Peter Lombard. For comparative figures, cf. the authorities cited in Nicole Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe de*

cations. For some sermons, they help to fix a *terminus post quem*. One is a verse cited from Walther of Châtillon's *Alexandreis* (*Reminiscere misericordiarum tuarum, Domine, que a seculo sunt* [Ps 24:6], fols. 37ra–38ra; JBS 19),²³ which places the sermon text some time after 1181, when the epic was in circulation.²⁴ Matthew of Vendôme's *Tobias* became a popular school text and was prized for its religious and moralizing character throughout the thirteenth century and into the early years of the next.²⁵ It is not surprising, then, to find it gracing the sermon *In omnibus requiem quesui et in hereditate domini morabor* [Eccli 24:11], fols. 98vb–100va; JBS 66).²⁶ A dedication to Archbishop Bartholomeus of Tours, who held office from 1174 to 1206, places the work firmly in the last quarter of the century. A reference to Walter of Châtillon's *Alexandreis* advances the date a little, while an apparent allusion to the turmoil affecting Jerusalem moves it further forward to the end of the century.²⁷

The reception of two other works merits more extended discussion, because both help to set a *terminus ante quem* for a certain number of sermons and both incidentally have something to add to the debate about authorship. The six anonymous references to the *De doctrina cordis* turn out not to be as helpful as they initially appear for dating purposes.²⁸ While they anchor the ser-

la Houblonnière: Sermons aux clercs et aux simples gens à Paris au XIII^e siècle, 2 vols. (Paris, 1987), 1:106.

²³ Fol. 37vb, "Nota quomodo peccata proximorum debent occultari. Nota de Iaphet filio Noe; primo oculos auerit ne uideret pudibunda patris sui Noe inebriati uino. Vnde magister Galterus in Alexandreide: *Vinea plantatur et inebriat uua parentem* [4.202, ed. Colker]."

²⁴ Maura K. Lafferty, *Walther of Châtillon's "Alexandreis": Epic and the Problem of Historical Understanding* (Brepols, 1998), 183–89, reviews the evidence for dating the poem and concludes that its publication can be located no more precisely than the decade 1171–81. A. C. Dionisotti, "Walther of Châtillon and the Greeks," in *Latin Poetry and the Classical Tradition: Essays in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, ed. Peter Godman and Oswyn Murray (Oxford, 1990), 73–96 at 90–96, argues that the *Alexandreis* was largely complete before 1176, the probable year of its publication.

²⁵ See Franco Munari, *Mathei Vindocinensis Opera*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1977–88), 2:27 n. 30.

²⁶ Fol. 100ra–b, "Nota quod area uocatur quicquid habet quis pati mali in hac uita quasi les jarbes en tas, set boni sunt quasi les gerbes sub flagello. Et ubi plures flagellantes, bateour, ibi est citius batu. Sic ubi plures tribulationes etc. Vnde tribulatio est flagellum Dei ad separandum granum a palea idest cor ab amore mundi. Vnde Matheus Vindocinensis in Thobia uersificato: *Quod fornax auro, quod ferro lima, flagellum / messibus, est iustis asperitatis honus* [vv. 277–78, ed. Munari, 2:172]."

²⁷ See *Tobias* 2109–10 for the reception of Walther's poem, and 1877–80 for the allusion to the crisis in Jerusalem; this and other evidence is assembled by Munari, *ibid.* 2:23–25, who weighs the meagre evidence for the chronology of Matthew's life.

²⁸ Fol. 10ra, "Nota de aure rigida, ab anteriori aperta, modica; non mouetur capite immoto ut in libro de doctrina cordis primo tractatu circa finem de in auribus: Item auris semper aperta, sic obedientia semper debet esse parata" (JBS 1; cf. *De doctrina cordis*, Paris, BnF lat. 14956,

mons firmly in the thirteenth century, investigation reveals that this work, extant in almost two hundred manuscripts, can be located no more exactly than somewhere in the first half of the century.²⁹ Yet despite uncertainty on this matter, there can be no doubt that the preacher's knowledge and use of the treatise extended well beyond the six explicit references already mentioned. Many other sermons routinely incorporate, without acknowledgement, material from the work, ranging from an extensive summary of a major theme to the repetition of individual images and phrases.³⁰ This shared material may indicate that the *De doctrina cordis* served as a resource in several ways, but it does not follow necessarily that both the sermons and the treatise flowed from the same pen. The *De doctrina cordis* became extremely popular and left its mark on several genres of writing.³¹ Thus its presence in the sermon collection need not support a claim of common authorship.

The fact that the allusions to the *De doctrina cordis* are always anonymous does not indicate that the author of the sermons was referring to an earlier work of his own.³² The absence of a name may mean no more than the fact

fol. 67va, "Item auris semper est aperta, ita obedientia semper debet esse parata"); fol. 11rb, "Nota de portario uoluntatis, timore scilicet, in libro de doctrina cordis primo tractatu de custodia portarum domus" (JBS 2; cf. Paris, BnF lat. 14956, fol. 19va-b); fol. 13rb, "sicut alibi in libro de doctrina cordis primo tractatu de mensa tribulationis. Potus etiam est disciplina Domini" (JBS 2; cf. Paris, BnF lat. 14956, fol. 17ra-b); fol. 61ra, "De cantu nota in libro de doctrina cordis tractatu septimo de quarto amoris signo extatici" (JBS 36; cf. Paris, BnF lat. 14956, fol. 129ra-b; this section of the *De doctrina cordis* was edited from Leiden, Bibliothèque de l'Université BPL 2579, by G. Hendrix, "Les Postillae de Hughes de Saint-Cher et le traité *De doctrina cordis*," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 47 [1980]: 114-30 at 124.240-127.340); fol. 98ra, "Require melius de proprietatibus hale in libro de doctrina cordis ad modum domus" (JBS 64; cf. Paris, BnF lat. 14956, fol. 24rb-va); fol. 98rb, "Require de hoc, de confessione in primo tractatu de doctrina cordis, capitulo de preparatione cordis ad modum domus" (JBS 64; cf. Paris, BnF lat. 14956, fol. 3va-5va).

²⁹ For a survey of the manuscripts of the *De doctrina cordis*, see G. Hendrix, "Handschriften en in handschrift bewaarde vertalingen van het aan Geraard van Luik toegeschreven traktaat *De doctrina cordis*. Een overzicht," *Ons geestelijk Erf* 51 (1977): 146-68, and "Handschriften van het traktaat *De doctrina cordis*. Aanvullende opsomming," *Ons geestelijk Erf* 54 (1980): 39-42.

³⁰ For the former, see the excerpt *De impedimentis* from the *De doctrina cordis*, printed in G. Hendrix, "De apercione cordis, De impedimentis and De custodia linguae: Three Pseudo-Bernardine Texts Restored to Their True Author, Hugh of St. Cher," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 48 (1981): 185-90; compare the summary of the same material in the sermon *In omnibus labora* (fol. 63rb-64vb; JBS 38) at fol. 64rb: "Et nota septem impedimenta que nos impediunt ne legamus in libro conscientie, que significata sunt per illa sigilla, gallice fermanz, Apo. vi, [Apoc 5:1] quibus signatus est liber."

³¹ See G. Hendrix, "Le *De doctrina cordis*, source directe du *Chastel perilleux*," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 50 (1983): 252-66. Zink, *La prédication en langue romane*, 51, notes that a treatise in Paris, Arsenal 2058 (46), *Omni custodia*, is a translation from Gérard of Liège's *De custodia cordis*.

³² For a case in which this does apparently occur, see D'Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*,

that the treatise circulated *sine nomine*. Among the 190 manuscripts so far documented, fully 140 exemplars lack an attribution to a specific author.³³

Against these general considerations, however, should be set others of a more detailed kind. It is inappropriate, given the repetition of common material in the homiletic genre, to approach an author's sermons expecting to distill from them unique characteristics. Medieval sermon authors made no claim to originality or innovation and were generally content to repeat stock material. But a preacher's personal imprint or style can be inferred from the materials he chooses to combine. As already mentioned, the second hand added the information that the sermon *Sciens Ihesus* (JBS 63) was the work of a "brother Gérard of Liège." This notice may be valuable and deserves to be weighed carefully. A preliminary investigation shows that some passages in this sermon are similar in thought and phrasing to several in the *De doctrina cordis*, as these two excerpts illustrate:

... sicut accidere dicitur in ludo scacorum quod homo in proprio ludo non ita clare uidet sicut in ludo alterius, sic homo aliquando facilius percipit defectus alterius quam proprios (*De doctrina cordis*)³⁴;

Sic non curare debes quid de te fiat dummodo ipsum consequi, ipsum possidere ualeas, ut tu omne dampnum tam rerum quam corporis negligas idest ponas an nunchaloir (*De doctrina cordis*, Paris, BnF lat. 14956, fol. 55ra).

Exemplum de ludo scacorum ubi clarius uidet quis in ludo alterius quam in proprio. homo de facili crimen alterius intellegit (Paris, BnF lat. 16483, fol. 96vb);

Prou. xii *Qui negligit dampnum propter amicum, iustus est: dampnum scilicet rerum, amicorum, corporis et honoris . . . vnde Christus posuit (in) incuria, gallice en nunchaloir* (Paris, BnF lat. 16483, fol. 96ra).

The uncertainties regarding the identity and canon of Gérard of Liège complicate the task of determining the authorship of this and other sermons. The sermons in Paris, BnF lat. 16483, however, may contribute to resolving some of the difficulties. It is a reasonable inference that the later user of the manuscript based his identification of the authorship of *Sciens Ihesus* on his knowledge of these and perhaps other similarities, and, if so, it may be further inferred that he thought the *De doctrina cordis* was composed by Gérard of Liège. It also seems reasonable to propose that all other sermons in the col-

107, for the practice of Guillaume Peyraut, who refers to a treatise (probably his own) without mentioning his own name.

³³ See Hendrix, "Handschriften," passim.

³⁴ Cf. G. Hendrix, *Le manuscrit Leyde Bibliothèque de l'Université, BPL 2579, témoin principale des phases de rédaction du traité De doctrina cordis, à attribuer au dominicain français Hugues de Saint-Cher (pseudo-Gérard de Liège)* (Gent, 1980), 17, fol. 9r.

lection which incorporate excerpts of any length from the *De doctrina cordis* in a similarly anonymous way are to be attributed to the author of the sermon *Sciens Ihesus*, whoever he was.

In omnibus labora (JBS 38) is also instructive. It makes liberal use of subject matter treated at greater length in the *De doctrina cordis*. At the end of the sermon (fol. 64vb), the author suggests substituting one preaching text (2 Mach 1:4) for another (Apoc 8:1) and elaborating *de impedimentis apertio[n]is*:

Illud ultimum potest adaptari *Adaperiat Dominus cor uestrum* [2 Mach 1:4], et
prosequi de septem sigillis uel signaculis et de impedimentis apertio[n]is.

This note refers to the treatment of the nature and number of the *impedimenta apertio[n]is cordis* as it appears in the *De doctrina cordis*.³⁵ This shorthand notice establishes for this sermon, at least, and by implication for others in Paris, BnF lat. 16483 that incorporate matter from the treatise, the priority of the *De doctrina cordis*. Furthermore, the lack of an explicit reference to the *De doctrina cordis* as the source for an alternative thematic approach would surely have limited its usefulness for others, an additional sign that this sermon was written for the author's personal use. In this form the reference would not have been suitable for a model collection.³⁶

The same hand that claimed *Sciens Ihesus* for Gérard of Liège ascribed the sermon *Afferam paxillum aque* (fols. 102rb–104rb; JBS 69) to Jean d'Abbeville. In this case, the reliability of the attribution can be impugned. The sermon appears to paraphrase and abridge a sermon written by Gérard of Mailly,³⁷ a French preacher, who flourished in the third quarter of the thirteenth century.³⁸ The influence of this popular preacher on other sermons in Paris, BnF lat. 16483 is evident in three other cases. Elements from Mailly 32 and 34 are incorporated into the sermons *Christus assistens pontifex futuro-*

³⁵ See Hendrix, "De apercione cordis," 185; and cf. Paris, BnF lat. 16483, fol. 64rb (n. 30 above). Cf. also *De doctrina cordis*, Paris, BnF. lat. 14956, fol. 87rb ("Lege ergo in libro tuo. Noli esse de illis qui libro proprio neglecto semper legere uolunt in alieno ut illi qui propriam conscientiam negligentes semper alienam conscientiam explorare et iudicare uolunt") and Paris, BnF lat. 16483, fol. 64vb ("Nota de clericis . . . qui in libris propriis nesciunt legere et in alienis legere uolunt aliorum conscientias temere iudicando").

³⁶ D'Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 98–100, discusses how people combined sermons from different collections to form new ones; he notes the example of Paris, BnF lat. 3737, which contains among many anonymous sermons works by Jean de la Rochelle, Nicolas de Biard, Guibert of Tournai, and Pierre de Saint-Benoît.

³⁷ Cf. Schneyer, *Repertorium* 2:485, Mailly 37: "Afferam paxillum aquae [Gen 18:4]. Verba sunt Abrahae, qui fixerat tabernaculum suum ad radicem Mambre, stantis in ostio tabernaculi."

³⁸ See L.-J. Bataillon, "Similitudines et exempla dans les sermons du XIII^e siècle," in *Bible in the Medieval World*, ed. Walsh and Wood, 191–205 at 193; D'Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 161–62, suggests that Mailly may have been a friar.

rum bonorum [Hebr 9:11] (fols. 85ra–86rb; JBS 56) and *Cum apropinquasset Ihesus Iherosolimam* [Mt 21:1] (fols. 90rb–91vb; JBS 61) respectively,³⁹ although they are not as obtrusive as they are in *Afferam paxillum aque* (JBS 69). More striking is the connection between the sermon *Erat Ihesus eiciens demonium* [Lc 11:14] (fols. 87ra–88rb; JBS 58) and Gérard of Mailly, whose themes and phrases have been reconfigured.⁴⁰

One important implication of these findings is to eliminate the possibility that the sermons in Paris, BnF lat. 16483 that contain material from Gérard of Mailly's model collection, the *Abiciamus*, were written by either of the Cistercian abbots named Gérard. While the exact date of Mailly's literary activity is not known, his two model collections were complete by 1275, although they circulated earlier, because Ranulph de la Houblonnière quarried them for material for his own sermons.⁴¹ Because the manuscript tradition of the

³⁹ See Schneyer, *Repertorium* 2:485, Mailly 34: “*Cum apropinquasset Jesus Jerosolymis* [Mt 21:1]. Solent nobiles cum gaudio magno et cum magno apparatu venire ad torneamenta”, cf. Paris, BnF lat. 16483, fol. 90rb.

⁴⁰ Compare the following:

1. Paris, BnF lat. 16483, fol. 87ra, “Ita est quod dyabolus quando intrat hospitium, statim claudit hostium post se ne aliquis alius post adueniens intrare possit qui eum expellat. Et extinguit lumen, quia dyabolus umbram diligit et fenestras obturat ne solis radiis cognoscatur. Sic solent facere diuites quando uolunt quiescere.” Cf. Gérard of Mailly, cited by Bataillon, “*Similitudines et exempla*,” 194.

2. 87ra, “Solet dici quod ille facit bonam dietam qui de fol se descombe.” Cf. Gérard of Mailly, p. 193: “Bonam dietam facit qui de fatuo se liberat.”

3. 87vb, “Nota de illo in Lombardia qui habuit in se tres demones, quorum unus dictus est Cloburs, alius Clocuer, alius Cloboche.” Cf. Gérard of Mailly, p. 195: “Nota de demoniaco qui habebat tres diabulos, quorum unus dicebatur Clobourse, alius Clobouche, alius Clocuer.”

4. 88ra, “Item per famem fugatur dyabolus quant il est afamez, quia fames pellit lupum de silua.” Cf. Gérard of Mailly, p. 194: “Sexto eicitur ieunio sicut lupus de nemore eicitur fame.”

5. 88ra, “Nota illa tria . . . Prou. Fumus, stillicidium et litigiosa mulier.” Cf. Gérard of Mailly: “De isto triplici modo eiciendi dictur Prou. secundum aliam litteram: Tria expellunt hominem de domo sua, fumus, stillicidium et mala uxor.”

6. 88ra, “Mulier litigiosa est conscientia que semper litigat et remurmurat contra peccatores, sicut facit mulier quando maritus eius reddit de taberna et increpat eum. . . . Nota quod quidam ita consueuer(u)nt pati litigium uxoris quod non curant. Sic non curant aliqui de remorsu conscientie sue, immo nolunt audire. Nota de milite qui quando recolebat uitam suam, incipiebat lacrimari et quia uolebat repellere hunc remorsum conscientie sue ludebat ad scacos et aleas.” Cf. Gérard of Mailly, p. 194: “Secundo eicitur sicut homo de domo sua tedio litigiose mulieris, id est conscientie remordentis. . . . Sed nota quod quidam ita consueuerunt audire litigium mulieris quod quasi nichil reputant; sic multi non multum reputant remorsum conscientie. Exemplum de eo qui recolens uitam suam incipiebat lacrimari et quia uolebat repellere remorsum conscientie ludebat ad scacos.”

7. 88ra, “Fumus est deuotio quando scilicet orat homo pro peccatis suis.” Cf. Gérard of Mailly, p. 194: “Quarto eicitur demonium sicut homo de domo sua fumo deuocionis.”

⁴¹ Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe* 1:80–87, records the many debts of Ranulph de la Houblonnière's Sermon 7, delivered in Paris in 1273, to Mailly's collection *de tempore*. Delisle, *Le cabinet des*

Abiciamus reveals that it circulated widely,⁴² it is a reasonable inference that the author of BnF lat. 16483, like Ranulphe de la Houblonnière, consulted it for the plan and development of many of his own sermons.

AUDIENCES

For whom, then, were the sermons composed? In the absence of rubrics, what can we infer from analysing the contents to discover the identity of an original audience for individual sermons or for the intended audience of the whole? Once again, the collection offers no clearcut evidence.⁴³ The sermons were initially designed in all likelihood for personal use,⁴⁴ although subsequent users could have easily exploited references in the collection to sources located elsewhere within the work as well as to treatises that lay outside it. The sermons lack a prologue and contain no statement that they were gathered as a model collection.⁴⁵ While they bear certain markings that might categorize it as such, counter indications suggest that it was put together for individual use. The organization of the table of contents appears to point in this direction. For each sermon care has been taken to add to the initial quotation of the biblical or liturgical text the distinctions on which the text is principally built. This method of reference would have been suitable for re-employing these subdivisions for the same liturgical occasion or for others. In addition, if the marginal notes of the second hand are discounted, the indications of the liturgical feast for which the sermon was intended are very few. In fact, the additions made by the second hand reveal that this particular mode of presentation did not satisfy all subsequent users of the work. It was

manuscrits 2:193, notes the record of the surety (*pignus*) left by a “magister Johannis Pestel” for two books that he had borrowed from the Sorbonne, one of which was the “sermones *Abiciamus*.⁴⁶”

⁴² Bériou, “Les sermons latins après 1200,” 406–7, notes that in Paris Saint-Victor and the Sorbonne were important centres in circulating Gérard of Mailly’s model collections.

⁴³ Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe* 1:146, underscores the difficulties surrounding this task, unless comparative material is available for study. Zink, *La prédication en langue romaine*, 240–43, 477–78, notes how a French sermon from Amiens (Paris, BnF Picardie 158), which reported a sermon addressed to the people, was later turned in its written form, as the rubrics demonstrate, into reading for an individual.

⁴⁴ Zink, *La prédication en langue romaine*, 478, happily refers to this process as “la prédication dans un fauteuil”; he notes that sermons for reading were directed at the segment of society who were attracted to the ethos of the cloister, including nuns, beguines, and lay brothers. Bériou, “Les sermons latins après 1200,” 409–10, discusses compilations of sermons for private use; D’Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 92–93, calls them “pastoral handbooks.”

⁴⁵ D’Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 105–9, lists the signs that usually characterize model collections of sermons.

not usual in model collections for the notation of the liturgical feast to be omitted. In the absence of these rubrics, the second hand felt free to designate several texts as suitable for delivery on liturgical occasions of his own choosing. For example, in the margin near the preaching text *Super te Iherusalem orietur dominus* (fols. 78va–79ra; JBS 50), he commented, “sermo potest hic esse per totum aduentum.” At the foot of fol. 91vb, which contains the sermon *Expecta dominum* (fols. 91vb–94ra; JBS 62), he observed, “Dominica prima uel tercia aduentus saluatorem expectamus.” On fol. 106ra a similar note was attached to the sermon *Simile est regnum celorum homini negotiatori* (fols. 106ra–107ra; JBS 72) as follows: “sermo potest hic esse dominica prima aduentus domini: *Negociamini*, dicit Christus, *dum uenio* etc.”

Other sermons contain as part of the text, not as marginal comments, directions that point to oral delivery at some stage, so that it is unlikely that the sermons were intended exclusively for private meditation, e.g., fol. 8ra, “Expone auctoritatem propositam *Deus autem patientie et solacii* ut supra [Rom 15:5]”; fol. 94rb, “Vel tertio modo expone sicut in fine illius sermonis *Si ambulauero in medio umbre mortis* etc.” (fols. 100va–101vb; JBS 67).⁴⁶ Consistent with this is the instruction on fol. 64vb, already mentioned, to substitute a different biblical text as a theme and a suggestion for developing different ones drawn from the *De doctrina cordis*, although the treatise is not named.

Isolated expressions offer tantalizing hints regarding a possible milieu for a few pieces. In *Ego stigmata Domini Ihesu in corpore meo porto* (fols. 59ra–61rb; JBS 36), St. Francis is named (fol. 59ra), but the name lacks the identifying adjective *noster*.⁴⁷ The Franciscan atmosphere is evoked later in the same sermon (fol. 60va) in the story of Joseph’s cup that was discovered in the sack of Benjamin. The latter is allegorized as St. Francis: “per Beniamin fratrem minimum beatus Franciscus li freres minors” (fol. 60ra).⁴⁸ Continuing in the same vein, the sermon mentions the robe of St. Francis and alludes to the order of friars minor.⁴⁹ One other sermon uses imagery that may have been designed to appeal to an order, though it cannot be identified. In the Advent sermon *Dominus prope est* (fols. 23rb–27va; JBS 12), Christ is said to have assumed at birth the *habitum ordinis nostri* (fol. 25vb), an allusion to the assumption of the bodily form of mankind. An additional allusion to the incarnation in terms of a *roba* (fol. 25vb) also leaves open the possibility of an

⁴⁶ For additional examples, see *ibid.*, 108 n. 2.

⁴⁷ See Bataillon, “Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons,” 27.

⁴⁸ Cf. Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe*, Sermon 4 (2:56.463–65): “Subuenit michi modo de uno uerbo quod mater mea solebat michi dicere. . . : ‘Belle fili, uidistis uos “les menuez” – sic solebant in principio uocari fratres minores.’”

⁴⁹ Fol. 60va–b, “Nota de funiculo beati Francisci et de nodis/corde.”

oblique reference to some religious order, possibly Franciscan.⁵⁰ Yet the reference remains uncertain, because the image of the *ordo* was widely used in sermon literature to designate all humanity. Moreover, in the preaching of the thirteenth century, as the sacrament of marriage was promoted, it too was promoted to lay people in terms of its being a “religious” *ordo* as well.⁵¹

The pericope read from the Gospel on the second Sunday of Advent by the Franciscans provides the sermon text for *Cum audisset Iohannes in uinculis opera Christi* [Mt 11:2] (fols. 14va–16rb; JBS 4).⁵² This may indicate it was preached in a church of a Franciscan convent, where the audience may have consisted of the brothers or the clerics from a university. At all events, arguments based on this kind of evidence are valid only for the piece in which it appears. It is the only one provided with a rubric by the first hand, which marked it for the second Sunday of Advent, although a second hand in the marginal note corrects that notice to the third Sunday. Unfortunately, the evidence does not permit a more specific identification of a religious order as the proximate audience. For the sermon *Pax Dei que exsuperat omnem sensum custodiat corda uestra* (fols. 18rb–19va; JBS 6), the rubric of the first hand specifies the fourth Sunday of Advent and the text chosen for comment was taken from the pericopes read on those days by the Dominicans and in the secular churches. Taken as a whole, however, there are few solid indications in favour of one or several audiences.

More striking are allusions to the life of the cloister which permeate the collection. These cannot identify with certainty the community for which they were intended, but they need to be weighed in any discussion of the author’s identity. The words *religiosi* and *claustrales* recur throughout, as the following examples illustrate:

Et post sequitur: *Elegit Iudas sacerdotes sine macula, uoluntatem habentes in lege Dei* [1 Mach 4:42], quia bonus et discretus confessor eligendus est ad

⁵⁰ Cf. Bériou, *La prédication de Ramulpe*, Sermon 8.4 (2:106, line 246): “Robe uestre quas uos portatis significant uitam quam debetis ducere” (addressed to beguines).

⁵¹ Cf. N. Bériou and D. L. d’Avray, “Henry of Provins O.P.’s Comparison of the Dominican and Franciscan Order with the ‘Order’ of Matrimony,” *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 49 (1979): 513–17, rpt. in *Modern Questions about Medieval Sermons*, ed. Bériou and d’Avray (Spoleto, 1994), 71–75. Cf. also David d’Avray, “The Gospel of the Marriage Feast of Cana and Marriage Preaching in France,” in *Bible in the Medieval World*, ed. Walsh and Wood, 207–24 at 210–11. Giles Constable, *Three Studies in Medieval Religious and Social Thought* (Cambridge, 1995), 254–310, discusses the various uses of the concept of *ordo* by medieval writers, noting that the doctrine of the three orders of prelates, continent and the married was spread by preachers.

⁵² Cf. M. O’Carroll, “The Lectionary for the Proper of the Year in the Dominican and Franciscan Rites of the Thirteenth Century,” *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 49 (1979): 79–103 at 85; cf. also D’Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 100 n. 2.

monachos. Sanctificatio deserta idest claustrum sine cultura discipline. Nota: nullus locus post infernum ubi nullus ordo tam abhominabilis sicut claustrum sine ordine, ubi Deo non seruitur. . . . Hic nota de meretricibus que circa monachos morantur (fol. 70rb, *Sanctificate ieiunium* [Joel 1:14]; JBS 43);

Cant. v [5:12]: *Oculi tui sicut columbe super riuos aquarum que lacte sunt lote.* Riui aquarum scripture sancte iuxta quas columbe idest claustrales debent residere (fol. 89vb, *Lauamini, mundi estote* [Is 1:16]; JBS 60);

Eccli. xxxg [30:24]: *Contine et congrega cor tuum in sanctitate eius.* Sequitur: *ut tecum sit in claustro quiescendo et tecum labor(et) extra claustrum laborando* (fol. 102rb, *Emitte, Domine, sapientiam* [Sap 9:10]; JBS 68).

In addition, the preacher dwells on the symbolism of the abbey,⁵³ refers to monks who fail to understand the signs of the abbot,⁵⁴ and accurately depicts the steps of entry into monastic life:⁵⁵

Sciendum autem quod septem habent considerari circa religionis ingressum. Primum est ordinis petitio; primo enim solent tales petere quod recipiantur.

Secundum est examinatio post petitionem, quia examinatur de moribus et scientia.

Tertium est impedimentorum interrogatio, ut si sit seruus.

Quartum est uestium religiosarum indutio, per quas significantur uirtutes et consuetudines religionis.

Quintum est conuiuii celebratio. Solent enim nouitii facere pastum in die sui ingressus.

Sextum est temporis probationis assignatio. Et in huiusmodi temporis spatio potest nouitius recedere, si uult.

Septimum est professionis emissio. Hanc faciet post transitum probationis huiusmodi uite in introitu celi celorum. . . . Tunc assignabitur professo locus in capitulo. . . .

⁵³ Fol. 43va-b, “Sextum uerbum est *humiles*; humilitas est claustrum quod debet nos tenere clausos. Claustrum quatuor latera habet que notantur in Ysa [Is 2:10] *Ingredere in petra, abscondere in fossa humo a facie timoris Domini, et a gloria maiestatis.* Primum *ingredere*, quasi diceret, considera bona que fecit nobis Dominus, quomodo natus, uulneratus etc. et sic humiliaberis. Secundum *abscondere in fossa humo* idest fode terram tuam idest cogita defectus tuos. Tertium *a facie timoris Domini*, quasi diceret, cogita penas inferni. Quartum *a gloria maiestatis eius*, sicut fit de muliere pulcra; si ponatur iuxta pulcriorem, uidetur amisisse pulcritudinem suam. Sic ponamus nos iuxta Dominum et sic humiliabimur” (*Omnes unanimes in oratione estote* [1 Petr 3:8]; JBS 22).

⁵⁴ Fol. 45vb, “Alii uocantur nutu manus, gallice par acener, idest signis creaturarum, que nobis innuunt ut ad Deum properemus. Malus est monachus qui non intelligit signa abbatis sui” (*Exi cito in uicos et plateas ciuitatis* [Lc 14:21]; JBS 24).

⁵⁵ Fols. 83vb-85ra (*Hic peccatores recipit et manducat cum illis* [Lc 15:2]; JBS 55).

The preacher can be severely critical of cloistered monks.⁵⁶ Finally, he had intimate knowledge of the *De doctrina cordis*, which he mentions by title, and from which he drew liberally, as already noted. This mystical treatise is centrally concerned with the cloistered life and the theme of individual perfection in the practice of contemplative prayer.⁵⁷ The ascetic strain in the teachings of the *De doctrina cordis* is pronounced, and clearly, when borrowings from this work occur in the sermons, this tendency will also be reflected. For certain sermons it represents an important work of reference, as, for example, in the sermon *In omnibus labora* (fols. 63rb–64vb; JBS 38). On this basis, it may be plausibly suggested that its author was a *claustralis* rather than a member of a mendicant order.

THE MIXTURE OF LANGUAGES

If certain sermons were composed for Franciscan or monastic chapter houses, the vestiges of French only add to their interest.⁵⁸ While the French idiom is proportionately small, it is larger, for example, than the scraps which survive in the sermons of Ranulphe de la Houblonnière.⁵⁹ It is notable that its presence within the Latin text went unnoticed by the scribe of Paris, BnF lat. 16483, who left no visual cues in his copy to mark it as a different language. The sermons themselves betray no anxieties that French was inadequate as a medium for translating the meaning of the Latin texts nor do they contain a word about any potential difficulties of communication that might arise as a result of switching from one language to another.⁶⁰ As noted at the outset of this article, the mix of languages perplexed Wilmart, who described the phe-

⁵⁶ See the excerpt from fol. 76 criticizing *clerici*, printed in Hauréau, *Notices et extraits* 4:30.

⁵⁷ Wilmart, “Gérard de Liège,” 373 and n. 59, underscores the emphasis on *claustrales* in the *De doctrina cordis*; on pp. 374–77 Wilmart cites from the *De doctrina cordis* passages that reveal the author’s knowledge of monastic customs; cf. Bataillon and Bériou, ““G. de Mailly,”” 21–22.

⁵⁸ Bataillon, “Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons,” 25, notes that Latin was not always the medium for regular or secular priests and cites the use of French to address some eleventh-century Norman monks.

⁵⁹ For comparative purposes, see Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe* 1:206–11, who supplies a glossary of Latin and medieval French words.

⁶⁰ Hunt, *Schools and the Cloister*, 94 n. 48, cites Alexander Neckam, *Commentary on Ecclesiastes* 1.8, on the subject of translation and the problems it caused him: “Hinc est quod dum per aliud idioma fideliter tanquam uerbo ad uerbum interpretari satagimus, nunc ipsa breuitate obscuritas procreatur, nunc intellectum debitum non representat ordo uerborum. Quis enim lingua gallica fideliter exprimeret intellectum horum uerborum: ‘instrumentum dicendi non subest sue dictioni’?”

nomenon as “un artifice voulu, un maniérisme,” and saw in it a sign of the author’s originality.⁶¹ But Suzanne Reynolds has observed that in multilingual societies verbal transactions may be delivered in one language, but recorded in another, depending on the status of the language in particular contexts.⁶² This observation is especially relevant to the production of sermons, as they evolved from oral delivery to written document. Popular sermons were certainly preached in the vernacular, but they generally survived as Latin texts. In this process, vernacular words survived most likely for functional rather than aesthetic ends. A reporter may have initially noted certain French words and expressions which may or may not have been retained in the subsequent task of redaction. Nicole Bériou’s study of two manuscripts, Paris, BnF lat. 16481 and 16482,⁶³ once the property of Peter of Limoges, is instructive in this connection. When the spare reportorial notes in BnF lat. 16481, interpolated with French, were reworked into the longer and more lucid Latin versions preserved in BnF lat. 16482, vernacular words tended to disappear, although a few were kept.⁶⁴ Although various reasons are cited to explain this, the claim that French words appeared in sermons when there was no equivalent Latin translation,⁶⁵ is not supported by the evidence of BnF lat. 16483.

What is certain is that the author of the sermons in BnF lat. 16483 was a francophone.⁶⁶ If they were initially delivered in the vernacular to a French

⁶¹ Wilmart, “Gérard de Liège,” 384; on p. 383 n. 88 he cites a few specimens of OF from the collection that appeared in Lecoy de la Marche, *La chaire française*; on p. 372 and n. 57 he notes that a French proverb in a copy of the *De doctrina cordis* was translated into Latin by the scribe.

⁶² Suzanne Reynolds, *Medieval Reading. Grammar, Rhetoric and the Classical Text* (Cambridge, 1996), 66, singles out the law, education, and government as fields in which this occurred.

⁶³ See Bériou and d’Avray, “Henry of Provins O.P.’s Comparison of the Dominican and Franciscan Orders with the ‘Order’ of Matrimony,” 514 (72) n. 4.

⁶⁴ Nicole Bériou, “La prédication au béguinage de Paris pendant l’année liturgique 1272–1273,” *Recherches Augustiniennes* 13 (1978): 105–229 at 114; in *La prédication de Ranulphe* 1:11 she remarks on the paradox of sermons written in Latin preserving traces of the spoken language.

⁶⁵ Robert. E. Lerner, “A Collection of Sermons given in Paris c. 1267, including a New Text by Saint Bonaventura on the Life of Saint Francis,” *Speculum* 49 (1974): 466–98 at 478 n. 44, remarks that sermons in the Munich manuscript Clm 23372, delivered to the laity in French and later translated into Latin, retained French words “that could not be easily translated or popular adages that would have seemed unrecognizable in translation.”

⁶⁶ D’Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 94–95, outlines the evidence that popular sermons were preached in the vernacular, but written down in Latin. Bériou, “Les sermons après 1200,” 384–85, offers examples of Latin sermon texts that reproduce vernacular word order and French words adapted by means of Latin endings. Reynolds, *Medieval Reading*, 62–63, notes that lexical glosses in the vernacular opened up Latin texts by providing definitions and equivalences for learners of the Latin language in the classroom.

speaking audience,⁶⁷ it remains an open question whether the stenographic reports were recorded in French.⁶⁸ If they were, then these rough notes were later collated, expanded and rewritten into Latin, to be used on other occasions⁶⁹ or gathered into a homiliary as a resource for preachers.⁷⁰ If, on the other hand, they were originally composed, delivered and recorded in Latin, then at some stage a bilingual preacher translated or paraphrased certain passages in the vernacular, probably to serve the needs of a mixed congregation.⁷¹ The scribe of BnF lat. 16483 was not the original *reportator* or the later copyist of the notes. Textual errors and gaps in the text show he was sometimes unable to decipher both the Latin and the French in his exemplar.

THE MIXTURE OF LATIN AND FRENCH: A TAXONOMY.

Before the publication of the complete vernacular Bible, individual books of the Scriptures were adapted into the vernacular, accompanied by glosses and comments, explanatory notes, glosses of rare words and terms, as well as

⁶⁷ Bériou, “Les sermons latins après 1200,” 386, notes the transmission of at least two sermons addressed to clerics that were based on a theme quoted in the vernacular, on p. 417, she cites indirect evidence that implies that some of Robert de Sorbon’s sermons were delivered in French.

⁶⁸ Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe* 1:109 n. 57, observes that reports of vernacular sermons preserved certain words, because they were either untranslatable or contained a play on words. See also Bataillon, “Approaches to the Study of Medieval Sermons,” 19–35; D’Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 93–95 at 22–23. For a discussion of sermons composed and recorded in the vernacular, see Zink, *La prédication en langue romane*, 94–100.

⁶⁹ D’Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 139, points out that the “telegraphic” form of some model sermons underlines their utility.

⁷⁰ See Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe* 1:11; D’Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 95, suggested that the embedded French element was probably “designed to help the user with the job of translating;” Once finalized and circulated, often in model collections, Latin sermons were absorbed into an international system, available for any literate cleric to adapt and translate into his own native tongue. Yvonne Cazal, *Les voix du peuple–Verbum Dei: Le bilinguisme latin–langue vulgaire au moyen âge* (Geneva, 1998), 34–36, notes that up to the eleventh century part of the program to encourage preaching involved the distribution of ready-made sermons in Latin to serve preachers as guides which could be tailored to the linguistic competence of his audience. She refers to the bilingual sermon on Jonas, composed between 937 and 952, which may have been based on a model of this type.

⁷¹ See D’Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 94–95; Constable, “Language of Preaching,” 137–38, suggests that several thirteenth-century sermons written in Latin and French in Poitiers, Bibliothèque municipale 97 (271) were probably delivered in both languages. Cazal, *Les voix du peuple*, 31–32, observes of the Carolingian period that while the synods urged priests to be aware of the linguistic competence of their congregations, this concern was subordinated to the injunction to preach, first of all, and a need to monitor the orthodoxy of the contents of the sermon.

moralizations and allegorical readings.⁷² This apparatus suggests an audience hungry for the potential meanings of a scriptural text rather than for a literal translation of it,⁷³ a tendency that is apparent in the treatment of biblical verses in our collection. Very few translations attempt to be faithful to the Latin text; many more are concerned to illuminate the sense of the biblical content.

The bilingual structure of the sermons reveals a hierarchy in which the vernacular is subordinated to Latin. The division of functions assigned to each reflects a stylistic and linguistic solution that the Church found pastorally acceptable and one that allowed the principal goals of the sermon to be met. On the one hand, the authority of ecclesiastical culture was maintained by citing scriptural and patristic texts in Latin in the written text of sermons,⁷⁴ while the vernacular had the subsidiary task of repeating and glossing their meaning.⁷⁵ This working relationship is visible in three principal areas in Paris, BnF lat. 16483. The first, and largest, finds the vernacular busy in mediating the meaning of biblical passages and the glosses that accompanied them. The second finds it operative as the natural expressive medium for contemporary proverbs and other popular sayings. The third finds it supplying lexical equivalents for a range of individual Latin words and phrases.

The vernacular is most concentrated in the area of translating biblical verses that vary in size from fragments to entire sentences. The mode of translation is as variable as the extent; it may closely track or rephrase the words of the Bible. A good example of fidelity to the original is D 58 in the wordlist below: “Eccli. xiii [13:9] *Humiliare Deo et expecta manus eius*, gallic humilie toi vers Deu et se regarde a sa main.”⁷⁶ Longer sentences are

⁷² C. A. Robson, “Vernacular Scriptures in France,” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 2, *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Cambridge, 1969), 436–52 at 436; Cazal, *Les voix du peuple*, 92, notes that the first complete Bible in the vernacular appeared in 1189, composed by Herman de Valenciennes.

⁷³ Cazal, *Les voix du peuple*, 90–91, notes that the Psalter was among the first books to be accommodated with a bilingual version, in which the vernacular explained obscure terms. She suggests that it was probably read to monks in the refectory.

⁷⁴ The *reportationes* by Peter of Limoges that preserved scriptural verses in French is an exception that proves the rule. See Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulph* 1:103; Jacqueline Hamesse, “‘Reportatio’ et transmission de textes,” in *The Editing of Theological and Philosophical Texts from the Middle Ages*, ed. Monika Asztalos, Acts of the Conference arranged by the Departments of Classical Languages, University of Stockholm, 29–31 August 1984 (Stockholm, 1986), 11–34, discusses the origins of the technique and its development in the Middle Ages.

⁷⁵ Cazal, *Les voix du peuple*, 36–37, emphasizes that the vernacular was admitted into sermons as an expedient to meet the linguistic reality faced by the Church.

⁷⁶ Smaller units are literally rendered, e.g., in F 33, “Job [17:3] *Libera me Domine, fran-chis moi*” (cf. Mario Roques, *Recueil général des lexiques français du moyen âge I: Lexique*

sometimes divided into their component parts, with a translation appended after each, as occurs, e.g., in D 57: “Ysa xiii [Is 14:1] *Prope est ut ueniat tempus eius*, pres est li tens qui doit venir, *et dies eius non elongabuntur* scilicet ab eo, idest prolongabuntur, les jors k’ il a mis, il ne porlongera mie.” Here the first part follows the Latinate word order, while the syntax of the second inverts the Latin passive into an active French verb, thereby shifting the emphasis to God’s agency and the immediacy of his concern. Cases in which biblical passages are cited in French independently of the Latin are extremely rare. An instance occurs in G 2, where the text of Ps 72:3 is first presented in Latin, but a subsequent reference to the next verse is followed not by the citation of Ps 72:4 (“Quia non est respectus morti eorum”), but by a close paraphrase of intermingled French and Latin. Here the preacher altered the syntax by substituting verbs for the cluster of nouns found in the Vulgate: “Et loquitur ibi psalmista de otiosis iuxta illud: *pacem peccatorum uidens* [Ps 72:3]; et prosequere sic: il ne se prennent garde quod debeant mori.” Occasionally a translation expands the original in order to ensure clarity, as the following cases reveal: C 1, “Sequitur: *Abstine te a lite* [Eccli 28:10], suffre toi et consirre toi de censer”; B 27, “*Et de luto fecis* [Ps 39:3], quasi diceret, il m’a trait fors de la boe et de la lie.”⁷⁷

The mechanics of the two languages operate differently upon Job 1:20 (“Tunc surrexit Job, et scidit vestimenta sua, et tonso capite corruens in terram, adoravit”): A 25, “*Surrexit et depeca*⁷⁸ sa robe et *encendra*⁷⁹ siue totondit caput suum et chai toz plaz a terre. . . .” This version shows no dependence on the Bible of Saint Louis (ca. 1250–54), the oldest vernacular version of the book of Job in the West, which rendered the verse thus: “En cele hore se leva Job, et descira ses vestimenz, et deschevela sa teste, et chei en terre, et aora et dist.”⁸⁰ The preacher allows himself greater dramatic license in rendering John 11:43 in C 66, “*Lazare, ueni foras*, gallice il fremi, il se trobla, plora et cria a grant cri: ‘Ladres, is fors.’ ” He has taken care to include in the verba-

alphabétique, 2 vols. [Paris, 1936–38], 1:24.892, “emancipare francir”; 1:43.1666, “manu-
mittere francir”) and A 51, “absque federe [Rom 1:31] sanz alliance” (cf. Roques, 1:29.1098,
“fedus alliance”); cf. A 82, D 57, F 12.

⁷⁷ When the phrase recurs [F 30], the gloss presents the verb in Latin: “quasi diceret, ipse
me extraxit fors des mes lies.” Similarly indifferent in the choice of language are the verbs in B
20, “il se fait tort,” and T 9, “faciunt tort.” So too the same aphorism appears in Latin (D 26,
“. . . qui Deo seruit, Deum desert”) and French (D 27, “Nota: qui Deu sert, Deu desert . . .”).

⁷⁸ Roques, 1:18.628, “decerpere depecier.”

⁷⁹ Did the translator present alternatives because he was unsure about the meaning of *tonso*
capite or was he referring to a procedure that involving singeing the hair? Cf. Roques,
1:37.1392, “incinerare encendrer.”

⁸⁰ The translation is cited in C. A. Robson, “Vernacular Scriptures,” in *Cambridge History*
of the Bible 2:444.

tim translation part of a biblical passage that is not cited in the excerpt (*uoce magna clamauit*). The rest is built upon an earlier narrative detail in order to increase the emotional effect (Jo 11:38: “Jesus ergo rursum *fremens in semet-ipseo* . . .”). Taking this as a cue, he works towards the climactic moment by means of additional verbs that echo the sense of *fremir*. In another approach, a literal translation veers off into moralization (e.g., C 20, “*Et eduxit me de lacu miserie* [Ps 39:3] et il me gita fors de la parfun de chartre, ubi li cheitif ponuntur”).⁸¹

On a smaller scale, single Latin words in a scriptural verse often trail a lexical equivalent in French (e.g., E 55, “*Sequitur* [Eccli 32:14]: *ante grandinem pressit coruscatio, esparz . . .*”⁸²). Sometimes, the reader is offered a choice between two vernacular words without the preacher stating a preference, e.g., A 93, “*Ysa. xiii^o* [14:11] *Subter te sternetur tynæa, gallice tegne uel artuisions. . .*”⁸³

French words also act to explain Latin glosses that accompany particular words or phrases in biblical extracts. Thus a vernacular lexical equivalent of a Latin gloss upon a Latin word is found in A 93, “*Ysa xiii^o* [14:11] . . . et *operimentum tuum erunt uermes, ecce opertorium, gallice covertoirs.*”⁸⁴ Again, the preacher resorts to French whenever he needs to elucidate abstruse terms (e.g., D 51, “*Mt xix^o* [19:23] *Amen dico uobis, quia diues difficile intrabit in regnum celorum, quia porta angusta est et oportet destrare, idest destrosser, summarios, idest les sommiers*). Similarly, a good example of an extended French gloss appears, e.g., in A 10, “*Iob vi [6:4] Saggite Domini in me sunt, quarum indignatio ebibit spiritum meum idest destruit superbiam meam uel spiritualitem meam quod idem est, idest a mon orguel abatue.*” Interventions of this type are as often as not introduced by *gallice*⁸⁵ or *idest*.⁸⁶

The vernacular is also active in the area of interpretive glosses in which both languages operate in parallel. A comment begun in Latin is completed by a clause entirely in French, e.g., A 48, “*Et abiit uagus in uia cordis sui* [Is 57:17] *per desideria diuersa et peccata; qui in Deo non inuenit solacium, aille*

⁸¹ Similarly, Notker’s translation of the book of Job and the Psalter followed each verse of the Vulgate with a translation and some lines of commentary; cf. Jean Leclercq, “Les traductions de la Bible et la spiritualité médiévale,” in *The Bible and Medieval Culture*, ed. W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (Leuven, 1979), 263–77 at 269.

⁸² Cf. Roques, 2:88.2496, “*coruscacio . . . onis resplendissent et proprement de foudre.*”

⁸³ Roques, 2:416.2467, offers only one: “*tynæa . . . ee artuison. c'est vers de drap.*” A minority is signalled by *idest*, e.g., C 50, 51; E 63; F 32; H 9; Q 1; others by *gallice*, e.g., A 47, 71, 96; D 32, 71; E 41, 57; F 29; H 5; L 6, 11; R 17; S 1; T 7.

⁸⁴ Cf. Roques, 1:414.5903–3, “*operimentum couverteur / opertorium idem.*”

⁸⁵ E.g., A 93, 122; C 80; E 1; F 17; H 1; J 1; N 1; P 21; R 7, 12; S 16.

⁸⁶ E.g., D 51; R 21.

males voies.” Here both languages collaborate, but there are other cases in which French expresses the sense of the gloss independently, as two examples show:

Ps. [72:4] *Firmamentum in plaga eorum*, plagas idest peccata habent, si affermmez et endurez et si serrez et agrevez ke riens k'en i face, potest ualere (A 30);

Deus pacis aptet uos in omni bono [Hebr 13:20–21], quasi diceret, je pri le Deu pacis qu'il nos rende aperz et avenenz a touz biens . . . (A 76).⁸⁷

Elsewhere, the two languages are inextricably mixed:

Nocenti te [Eccli 28:2] dicitur en chaudes, quando il te nuit, non postquam nocuerit, quia in illo puncto qu'il te mesfait idest statim quando les plaies sunt nouvelles idest li mesfait novel li doiz pardonner, quia est difficilius (C 25).

Second, the methods used to reinforce the meaning of the sermon’s theme and the rest of the biblical citations are mimicked in the approach to proverbs and other popular expressions.⁸⁸ Proverbs formed a vital part of the preacher’s arsenal, and were regularly introduced to make a point vivid and memorable, as it does in A 21, where a vernacular proverb caps the commentary on Ps 65:18. It has been suggested that vernacular proverbs were left in their original form because they might not be recognized when rewritten in Latin.⁸⁹ But they were routinely turned into Latin in BnF lat. 16483. For instance, the proverb “La faim chasse le loup hors du bois” appears not in French, but in two close Latin translations; first on fol. 77vb as *fames fugat lupum de nemore*, and then on fol. 88ra in the form *fames pellit lupum de silua* (A 29).⁹⁰ However, the well-known “L’orgueil fait cheoir” survives only in Latin (T 15). Occasionally a proverb is paraphrased; for example, the OF proverb “Qui bon morsel met en sa bouche bone novele envoie au cuer” clearly stands behind A 96, “Expone auctoritatem propositam *Deus autem patientie et solaci*, ut supra, *det uobis id ipsum sapere* [Rom 15:5], hoc ad sacramentum altaris, gallice une meime viande assavorer, ut ille idem morcellus qui transit per os corporis transeat per os cordis.” Usually, however, the phrase “secundum uulgarere” (e.g., F 7) or “uulgariter” signals the presence of a vernacular proverb behind the Latin. Alternatively, an aphorism may be retained in Latin, only to

⁸⁷ See also D 66, “. . . non dicit *dereliquo*, set etc., ut si li droez est soit siens et li torz soit notres.”

⁸⁸ The latter are usually marked by the following phrases: *dicitur uulgariter . . .*, e.g., A 118, 121; B 16; C 31, 65; E 27, F 7; *solet dici*, e.g., E 65; *communiter dicitur*, e.g., E 71.

⁸⁹ See note 61 above.

⁹⁰ See James Woodrow Hassell, Jr., *Middle French Proverbs, Sentences, and Proverbial Phrases*, Subsidia Mediaevalia 12 (Toronto, 1982), F 1. All the OF proverbs identified in Paris, BnF lat. 16483 antedate the earliest examples cited by Hassell.

be followed immediately by a French version, e.g., A 37, “. . . quia *medium tenuere beati et in gallico Mesure dure.*” In one case, the initial words of the original French proverb serve as a literal gloss; thus “Grant planté n'a saveur” (Hassell P 195) is directly translated as “Nimia fertilitas idest plantez⁹¹ trop granz saporem non habet” (G 20). Direct also is the translation of “A qui il méchoit, chascum luy mesoffre” (Hassell M 103), but here it parades in a mixture of the two languages: “Mos est dyaboli statim peccatori eruere oculos, postquam ceperit peccatorem, quia si relinquerentur ei oculi, non ita de facili duceretur per quoslibet malos passus. Per malos passus dicit eum, quia ‘cui male accidit, en li mesoffre’” (M 22).⁹² The process is reversed when “A tart est vengé qui Deus venge” is translated in T 1, “Hic fallit proverbum: A tart uindicatur quem Dominus uindicat.” In none of these examples are the translations from one language to the other significantly different.

Third, French operates as a support in other areas of the sermons. In this role it reinforces a Latin word or phrase with a synonym, with or without⁹³ the signposts of *gallice*, *idest*, or *scilicet*;⁹⁴ thus, G 17, “Non iacet homo libenter in stillicidio, en gotiere.”⁹⁵ Its presence is sometimes needed to specify a particular sense of a polyvalent Latin word, e.g., E 48, “concha, l'escreffe.”⁹⁶ In this area, a verb covers a verb,⁹⁷ a participle a participle, an infinitive an

⁹¹ Roques, 1:29.1096; 1:335.3243, “fecunditas planté.”

⁹² Similarly, the French proverb “Bone journee fait qui de fol se delivre” is not cited entirely in French (cf. Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe*, Sermon 7 [1:81], “cil fet bone journey qui se delivre de un fou”), but is shared between the languages in D 22, “Solet dici quod ille facit bonam dietam qui de fol se descombre. . . .” Bataillon, “*Similitudines et exempla*,” 193, notes that William of Mailly’s version of this proverb in Latin is exceptional; Roques, 1:21.747, “dieta journee.” Hassell, *Middle French Proverbs*, 258, lists proverbs in a mixture of Latin and OF.

⁹³ E.g., C 32, “eques, a cheval” (cf. Roques, 1:324.2850, “Eques qui va a cheval”).

⁹⁴ Cf., e.g., A 104, 105; B 7, “hyare, gallice baer” (cf. Roques, 1:351.3815, “Hiare beer uel bailler”); B 10, “greges, gallice bergeries”; C 6, “luctator noster, gallice champions”; C 15; C 30, “Vermes, scilicet les chenilles”; C 42, “cuneo, gallice coig” (Roques, 1:302.2079, “cuneus coign uel compengie”); C 69, “creta, idest de croie” (Roques, 1:299.2007, “creta croie”); D 18; D 20, “munitum idest garniz” (Roques, 1:401.5462). See Gernot R. Wieland, *The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge University Library, MS Gg. 5. 35*, Studies and Texts 61 (Toronto, 1983), 26, for a definition of lexical equivalence between lemma and gloss.

⁹⁵ See Roques, 1:483.8172, “stillicidium goutiere.” Cf. also C 32, “eques, a cheval” (Roques, 1:25.916, “eques a ceval”), F 9, “similat . . . , gallice fait samblant” (cf. Roques, 1:25.18, “equare samblant faire”).

⁹⁶ Cf. Roques, 1:290.1661, “concha oestre uel escale de limachon; uersus: Concha notat piscem concham dic esse legumen | Conchaque quandoque testa limacis erit.” This is also the case in M 33, “. . . sicut funditur campana in modulo suo, gallice mole.”

⁹⁷ Note the economy of the French gloss in E 10, “Ecclesia obligata est debitis, gallice endetee”; D 36, “Ante incarnationem totus mundus erat extra mensuram idest desmesurez.”

infinitive, a noun a noun,⁹⁸ and so on, whether the word is common or not.⁹⁹ It is exceptional for an OF word to be covered by a Latin equivalent: A 97, “*Adde de epulatore domigeroso, dongereus, qui cibos non bene assavorez, conditos, reicit in faciem seruitoris.*”

Although the snatches of French are occasional and supplemental,¹⁰⁰ the languages often complement one another to emphasize a moral or theological point, e.g., A 100, “*Sexto confidentia et asseurement de auxilio*”;¹⁰¹ A 120, “*memoria et la souvenance.*”¹⁰² In these non-biblical cases, only rarely is the vernacular marked,¹⁰³ e.g., A 19, “*Dominus nos acene; gallicum est*”; A 69, “*secundum uulgare angoisseus appellantur auari.*”¹⁰⁴ Otherwise, the two languages are braided silently, with the French syntax perfectly meshed with the Latin. The complexity that can result from this mixture is caught in A 61, “*Vnde quia aliquis se delite et glorifie in temporalibus istis et deliciis mundi, quia uidet minus et non le plus, ipse sentit le delit et non l'amertume, quia gaudia et delicie huius mundi sunt uns buvrages destempres de dolor et dulcedo distemperata amaritudine.*” This interchange reveals a certain rhetorical flair in the balanced synonyms, *delit* with *delicie*¹⁰⁵ and *destempres* with *distemperata*. The exchange assumes more complex forms in, e.g., B 21, “*Pusillanimitas est fallance et lassetez et petitesce cordis et pigritia d'entreprender les biens a faire et de parsivrre bonum quod habemus entrepris et impatientia ad malum patiendum.*” Unlike the previous example, key words are not repeated as the languages alternate. In other cases, parts of a sentence are assigned to different discourses (e.g., F 2, “*Vbi non habetur iste panis, en i muert de fain*”), but the vernacular can function autonomously, as it does in

⁹⁸ There are exceptions, e.g., E 51, “*sine forma, gallice effacie*”; M 13, “*per matrimonium maxime, par miez marier.*”

⁹⁹ E.g., A 1, “*submittit, abaisse*” (cf. Roques, 2:403.12022, “*summitto, mittis soubz-mettre*”); A 4, “*exposita, abandonee*”; A 8, “*implicare, emploier*” (cf. Roques, 1:359.4081); A 23, “*alieni, idest estrange*” (cf. Roques, 1:248.290); A 41, “*colonus, gallice eschennierres*” (cf. Roques, 1:286.1546, “*collonus enhennour*”).

¹⁰⁰ See, e.g., M 37, “*Abraham in hostio tabernaculi est Christus in egressu mortis, gallice sor le point de sa mort.*”

¹⁰¹ Wenzel, *Macaronic Sermons*, 86, terms this pattern “the structure of coordination” and notes that “macaronic doublets” were a common stylistic feature in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century writers of English sermons.

¹⁰² Cf. C 38 where *memoriam* is glossed by *la souvenance*. Note too E 6, where the Latin and OF verbs join forces (“*corrumpunt et empirent*”) to gloss *adulterant*.

¹⁰³ Sometimes the Latin term does not appear; in these cases the switch in linguistic registers is signalled by *gallice* (cf. L 7, “*Nota de illis qui extrahi nolunt filo tenui gallice de lie*”; T 10, “*Naute dirigunt cursum suum ad stellam gallice transmontene.*”

¹⁰⁴ Roques, 1:260.721 “*auarus aver.*”

¹⁰⁵ Cf. *ibid.* 1:307.2253, “*delicie delices.*”

the striking medical comparison in A 54, “Vnde sicut en termine de maladie de cors par suer, ita li terminers de la maladie de l’amme est par dolor.”

For the rest, French helps to clarify allegorical interpretations and etymologies, e.g., D 2, “Superbi dicuntur declinantes, quia uadunt ad declin¹⁰⁶”,¹⁰⁶ G 16, “Ideo tales dicuntur glutones, gloton, a glutiendo.” French carries the thought to completion in L 7, “Nota de illis qui extrahi nolunt filo tenui gallice de lie.”

CONCLUSION

The way in which the written vernacular interacts with Latin in Paris, BnF lat. 16483, shows how permeable the boundaries between them were. They must have shifted constantly during the course of editing the sermons.¹⁰⁷ The linguistic switching covers the complex social interactions that were in play whenever learned clerics¹⁰⁸ fulfilled their pastoral duty of caring for the souls of faithful, whether monks, nuns¹⁰⁹ or lay. Preachers who wanted their teaching to be effective had to be alive to the needs, desires and interests of their congregations.¹¹⁰ Even audiences within religious houses, which tended to be diverse, must have encountered some problems of communication.¹¹¹ The new religiosity that blossomed in the thirteenth century found concrete expression in several different groups. The great Franciscan and Dominican orders shared in the spiritual renewal by preaching in towns and cities,¹¹² while less impor-

¹⁰⁶ Cf. *ibid.* 1:304.2179, “declinare decliner uel abecer.” Similarly in D 53, “Rete dicitur a retinendo; de ce que tu retiens de autrui . . .”; cf. Roques, 1:460.7414, “retinere retenir.”

¹⁰⁷ See Bériou, “Les sermons après 1200,” 386. Constable, “Language of Preaching,” 137, emphasizes the constant exchange between Latin and French not only in sermons but also in other types of literature.

¹⁰⁸ Note, e.g., the use of Latin grammar as the basis for developing the first sermon: “*Deus autem patientie et solacii det uobis id ipsum sapere in alterutrum etc. ut honorificetis deum etc.* Ro. V [Rom 15:5–6]. Hoc nomen *Deus* in hac epistula construitur cum triplici genituo; dicitur enim Deus patientie et solacii et spei ad denotandum tres aduentus” (fol. 7ra; JBS 1). A reference to the rhetorical figure of *geminatio* apropos a biblical phrase in F 1 is in the same key.

¹⁰⁹ D’Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 95 n. 2. Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe* 1:146, observes that Ranulphe used French in a sermon delivered before a lay audience in order to recapitulate his message.

¹¹⁰ See Beverly M. Kienzle, “The Twelfth-Century Monastic Sermon,” in *Sermon*, ed. Kienzle, 271–323 at 287–88; Cazal, *Les voix du peuple*, 33, observes that the preoccupation with the social reality faced by preachers is a constant as far back as Jerome and Caesarius of Arles.

¹¹¹ See Constable, “Language of Preaching,” 142–43.

¹¹² Mary E. O’Carroll, *A Thirteenth-Century Preacher’s Handbook: Studies in MS Laud Misc. 511*, *Studies and Texts* 128 (Toronto, 1997), 133, 143–64, notes that the Dominican order’s spiritual responsibilities included nuns and beguines. She discusses a series of sermons

tant religious communities worked to realize the same goal. They included orders of regular canons, like the Augustinians, communities of hermits, as well as groups of laypeople who wanted to nurture their own spiritual and mystical longings. These organizations built cloisters and convents with their own economic and social structures which attracted members from different areas.¹¹³

Faced with the social, educational and linguistic diversity of these communities, the church allowed their voices to be heard by authorizing their native languages to share in the pastoral process.¹¹⁴ From this perspective the mix of languages reflects a compromise in the sociolinguistic conflict that grew out of the growing language gap between Latin and the vernaculars, even though it was less sharp in France than elsewhere.¹¹⁵ Latin, the language of the liturgy, had itself evolved as the vernacular of the church in Western Europe, supported by the availability of the Bible in Latin. But over time the exclusionary power of Latin¹¹⁶ posed problems in countries where the faithful wanted to hear or read the scriptures in their own language. As a result, explaining them to the laity became part of the church's mission. Projects, individual or collective, to translate the books of the Bible into the vernacular progressed at different speeds according to each country's linguistic circumstances. In France, socioreligious factors as well as language contributed to the emergence of a vernacular Bible.¹¹⁷ Whether the Old French Bible was the

preached by Dominican friars to nuns in Elstow ca. 1275–80; the sermons were probably delivered in English, as the nuns were not well-educated.

¹¹³ For a survey of recent scholarship, see P. Bertrand, "Ordres mendians et renouveau spirituel du bas moyen âge (fin du XII^e s.–XV^e s.): Esquisses d'historiographie," *Le Moyen Âge* 107 (2001): 305–15.

¹¹⁴ Cazal, *Les voix du peuple*, 92, notes the limits imposed by the church on using vernacular translations of the Bible as a base for preaching and education; on p. 311, she argues that the "épîtres farcies" and bilingual liturgical dramas were developed to respond to similar popular pressures.

¹¹⁵ See Hunt, *Schools and the Cloister*, 92 and n. 43. Constable, "Language of Preaching," 136–37, points to the evidence of charters which suggests that Latin, when read aloud, resembled the vernacular.

¹¹⁶ Cazal, *Les voix du peuple*, 304. For an instructive example, see Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe*, Sermon 4.6 (2:53.347–48): "Hoc dicas eis latinis verbis, non laicalibus propter scandalum"; apropos this, Bériou notes that bilingualism allowed the preacher to reserve for clerics remarks that could scandalize the people; cf. 1:103 n. 27; 143. Cazal, *Les voix du peuple*, 31, 306, emphasizes the church's wish to maintain "vertical communication" between clerics and the faithful; the former had the linguistic competence that gave them access to the Latin message of the Scriptures as well as a doctrinal competence that gave them control over orthodox interpretation. This monopoly was threatened when the laity demanded to participate and express themselves in their native tongue.

¹¹⁷ Michael Richter, "Latina lingua – sacra seu vulgaris?," in *Bible and Medieval Culture*,

result of a single project or not,¹¹⁸ by the close of the thirteenth century, the public had access to a complete Bible thanks to the commercial initiative of Parisian stationers.¹¹⁹ The intended publics included rich, devout persons with a hunger to read the scriptures in their mother tongue¹²⁰ to religious with a weak understanding of Latin. The Dominican order would have welcomed it as a means of promoting devotional reading among its own unlatinate members.¹²¹ So too would any woman who wanted to know the word of God in searching for religious and mystical experiences. While most monks and clerics read the Bible and recited the Psalter in Latin, the vernacular glosses that sprang up around the psalms evidently met a felt need for some of them.¹²² Similarly, the translation and glossing of biblical texts were also driven by pious laypeople. The forces that generated vernacular Bibles produced similar movements in the fields of pastoral and homiletic literature.¹²³ They are reflected in a small way in the amalgam of French and Latin that survives in our collection.¹²⁴

ed. Lourdaux and Verhelst, 16–34 at 18; on pp. 20–26 he summarizes the evidence for awareness of a difference between Latin and the *lingua romana*. Leonard E. Boyle, “Innocent III and Vernacular Versions of Scripture,” in *Bible in the Medieval World*, ed. Walsh and Wood, 97–107 at 100, discusses Innocent’s letters to the Bishop of Metz, who had informed the pope of laymen and women who in their desire for the Scriptures had commissioned translations into French of the Gospels, the letters of Paul, and the Psalter.

¹¹⁸ Clive R. Sneddon, “The Origins of the ‘Old French Bible’: The Significance of Paris, BnF MS fr. 899,” *Studi Francesi* 127 (1999): 1–13, argues that it was the result of a single enterprise. In “The ‘Bible du XIII^e siècle’: Its Medieval Public in the Light of Its Manuscript Tradition,” in *Bible and Medieval Culture*, ed. Lourdaux and Verhelst, 127–40 at 129, Sneddon summarizes the opposing view. Cf. C. A. Robson, “Vernacular Scriptures in France,” 436–52, in *Cambridge History of the Bible* 2:436–52 at 445–48.

¹¹⁹ Robson, “Vernacular Scriptures,” in *Cambridge History of the Bible* 2:441, dates the completion of the translation of the Bible into French not before 1280, because the laity had a limited interest in the literal text of the Scriptures.

¹²⁰ Robson, “Vernacular Scriptures,” 2:451, observes that the vernacular Bible was limited to those with enough wealth to buy a copy of the complete Bible.

¹²¹ See Sneddon, “The ‘Bible du XIII^e siècle,’” 127–40 at 135–39.

¹²² Leclercq, “Les traductions de la Bible,” 265–66, observes that certain Psalters in French were produced by monks, and that some even supported legitimizing the use of the living language to celebrate the Mass. Robson, “Vernacular Scriptures,” 2:439–41, notes that the Psalter was the book most widely studied by French-speaking laity; by contrast, the sapiential and prophetic writings and the Pauline epistles were not widely diffused until after 1317. Constable, “Language of Preaching,” 140–41, notes that the distinction between clerics as literate and the laity as *illiterati* broke down as the twelfth century progressed.

¹²³ D’Avray, *Preaching of the Friars*, 94, observes that communication with the laity was not the function of the sermon, if it was delivered in Latin.

¹²⁴ Schneyer, *Repertorium* 2:178, s.v. Gerardus de Leodio, lists two other manuscripts with sermons attributed to Gérard of Liège: Paris, BnF lat. 13581 (A) and 14956 (B). The latter

The compiler of Paris, BnF lat. 16483 drew from at least two other sermon collections. Preachers in the thirteenth century were encouraged to adapt the material in written sermons to suit the audience they had to address. While it is unlikely that the sermons from Paris, BnF lat. 16483 were delivered in a mixture of languages,¹²⁵ in its present form they could still have served multiple purposes, public and private, and continued to be useful long after they were originally collected. From a linguistic point of view, the vernacular element made them a practical resource for anyone whose office obliged them to preach to mixed audiences or communities. For example, it would reduce considerably the effort involved for any preacher who needed to translate the Latin passages when speaking to large crowds that included laypeople.¹²⁶ But the sermons were also meant to be read, as the cross-references within the collection attest. While this system made them practical for study and re-use by subsequent preachers, they would also have been suitable for lay readers who desired to study the scriptures for devotional reasons. From a catabatical or religious perspective, many of the sermons emphasized the Christian message in the context of community life, including the cloister, and had the added attraction of being enlivened with examples and illustrations drawn from contemporary culture, many expressed in French. If skilled reporters could simultaneously translate vernacular sermons into Latin during their delivery, it is easy to imagine a fluent bilingual preacher translating a written Latin homily into French when the situation and audience demanded.

contains a text of the *De doctrina cordis*, followed by a list of topics to be found in the work (fol. 133r). The sermons for the ecclesiastical year begin on fol. 137ra with the final sermon on fol. 231ra; fol. 235r is left blank. Fol. 1r of Paris, BnF lat. 13581 records the following: “Concessimus priori de turnomio vsum istius libri quam diu vixerit.” A list of proverbs appears on fol. 2r, with the sermons set out on fol. 3r–62v. After this, a different hand has copied out additional sermons to fol. 78v, with the final folio left blank. Both manuscripts record some of the same sermons, but neither copies them from the other. The two manuscripts do not contain the texts of any sermon copied out in Paris, BnF lat 16483, nor do they anywhere explicitly attribute their own collections to Gerard of Liège. Wilmart, “Gérard de Liège,” 378 n. 72, remarks that the sermons in Paris, BnF lat. 14956, bear no striking affiliation to the collection in Paris, BnF lat. 16483.

¹²⁵ Constable, “Language of Preaching,” 137–38, notes the revival of the old view among scholars that some sermons were actually delivered in macaronic form; he refers to the well-known bilingual sermon on Jonah in the tenth-century manuscript, Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale 521.

¹²⁶ Cazal, *Les voix du peuple*, 77, concludes that the so-called “épîtres farcies” that were part of the liturgy were delivered before audiences of different levels of education and status.

OLD FRENCH WORDS IN PARIS, BNF LAT. 16483

Because the conventions for spelling French in the thirteenth century were not standardized, for the convenience of the reader I have presented the headword for each entry in the form in which it is recorded in the *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch* by A. Tobler and E. Lommatzsch. In the excerpts listed under each headword, however, the original spelling of all French words is reproduced as it appears in Paris, BnF lat. 16483. In cases where Tobler-Lommatzsch do not include a word, I refer to the relevant entry in F. Godefroi, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*. The location of every French word in the manuscript is indicated by folio and column, followed by the citation of the sentence in which it appears. In each quotation the relevant French word is set in bold for quick identification. The number of items necessarily limits the amount of contextual material that can be provided for each individual item. To compensate for this, I offer in an appendix an edition of an entire sermon (*Fluuius egrediebatur* [Gen 2:10], fols. 21rb–22va; JBS 10), so that the reader can view the mixture of the languages on a broader canvas. In each alphabetical section, every entry is assigned a number, a notational system that allows for quick cross-reference and avoids needless repetition of material. Whenever a French word has appeared in a previous excerpt, the reader is directed to its first citation, which is identified by letter and number. I have also extracted the OF proverbs that I have been able to identify from printed sources and assembled them in a separate section after the alphabetical list.

I have retained the orthography of the manuscript with the following exceptions: the rare instances where Latin words are spelled with an initial *v* have been regularized to *u*; and in OF words the *i* has been changed to *j* and *u* to *v* (e.g., the manuscript's *foriugier* is printed as *forjugier*, and *uous* as *vous*). In the manuscript the French words appear without accents, and I have not added them in the quoted passages. In a few cases, I have corrected scribal errors and supplied the manuscript's reading within square brackets. The scribal abbreviations for the books of the Bible are not always cited as they appear in the manuscript; thus I print *Sap.* for the manuscript's *Sap^e*, but *Eccle.* for *Ecc^e*. Numerals in the body of the text have been expanded (e.g., *vque* and *xiiii^{im}* to *quinque* and *tredecim*). Quotations from all sources are presented in the form in which they appear in the manuscript. When a biblical verse is cited only by means of the initial letters of each word, I have silently expanded them, as well as all abbreviated ordinals up to ten; thus *1^a* appears as *prima*, but *xi^a* is reproduced as is. All scribal additions of letters and transpositions have been incorporated without notice. Capitalization and punctuation follow modern conventions.

ABBREVIATIONS

Godefroi = F. Godefroi, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialects du IX^e au XV^e siècles*, 10 vols. (Paris, 1884–1902).

Di Stefano = G. Di Stefano, *Dictionnaire des locutions en moyen français* (Montreal, 1991).

Hassell = James Woodrow Hassell, Jr., *Middle French Proverbs, Sentences, and Proverbial Phrases*, Subsidia Mediaevalia 12 (Toronto, 1982).

Morawski = J. Morawski, *Proverbes français antérieurs du XVe siècle* (Paris, 1925).

TL = A. Tobler and E. Lommatzsch, *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch* 10 vols. (Berlin, 1925–76).

adj. = adjective

s.f. = substantive feminine

adv. = adverb

s.m. = substantive masculine

part. = participle

vb. = verb

pron. indef. = indefinite pronoun

*** = lacuna in manuscript

⟨ . . . ⟩ = editorial additions

A

ABAISIER vb.

1 (100rb) Et sicut in area ubi plures flagellantes, quando unus eleuat suum flagellum, alias suum submittit, abaisse, sic quando homo qui Deo placet liberatus est ab una tribulatione, insurgit alia. . . .

ABANDONER vb.

2 (23vb) Cor enim sine Deo nescit se retinere, set laxat se et abandone.

3 (33vb) Nota de taberna Domini quomodo dedit nobis uinum sui sanguinis pour essai in circumcisione. . . . Vnde Dominus por tout abandoner suum sanguinem fecit dolium sui corporis afforer ad quinque brocas, sicut tabernarii faciunt quando ferentes multos potos ad uinum.

4 (50rb) Cor sine timore idest assecuratum est quasi domus disclausa et exposita, abandonee.

5 (66rb) Nota: duo sunt quibus emuntur denariate Domini, scilicet penitentia corporis et repentance cordis. Non plura habemus implicare et istis duobus sunt abandone quecumque Dominus potest finer.

6 (95va) Adde hic illud Eccli. xxxv^o [35:12] *Da Altissimo secundum donatum eius* idest sicut Christus nichil retinuit erga te, sic et tu nichil retineas erga ipsum. Vnde sicut suum totum fuit nobis abandonez, sic etc.

ABATRE vb.

7 (28va) Semper erant in eodem punto, numquam se chevioient nec gaudium amicorum les elecoit nec tristitia les abatoit.

8 (52ra) O quam bonum est implicare, emploier, denariatas suas, antequam clametur pagamentum et antequam moneta ista sit abatue quod erit in morte.

9 (52vb) Nota de istis nundinis et de pagamento et de moneta abatue.

10 (64ra) Iob vi [6:4] *Sagitte Domini in me sunt, quarum indignatio ebibit spiritum meum* idest destruit superbiam meam uel spiritualitatem meam quod idem est, idest a mon orguel abatu.

11 (64rb) Tertium est quia nescit quando erit edictum quod plus non positura hec moneta deponetur, idest sera abatu in futuro.

12 (66rb) Nota: denariate erunt encheries in morte et moneta penitentie erit abatu, que modo habet cursum.

13 (98va) Eccles. ix d [9:10] *Quodcumque <facere> potest manus tua, instanter operare. Instanter dicitur, quia in morte hec moneta deponetur, sera abatue.*

ABEVRER vb.

14 (21rb) Terra dicitur inebriari, quando intra imbuta est, gallice **abuvree**.

ABUISSEB vb.

15 (10vb) *Operamini dum dies est; uenit nox etc.* [Jo 9:4] *et antequam offendant, s'abuissent, pedes uestri ad montes caliginosos* [Jer 13:16]. Montes sunt demones presumptuosi qui propter superbiam ceciderunt. Ille s'abuuisse in presenti ad montes obscuros qui scandalizatus est de temptatione dyaboli. . . .

16 (21ra) Eccle. x [10:7] *Vidi seruos in equis* idest elatos de dignitate, set oportet bene tenere frenum quia cespitat, gallice il s'abuuisse, equus iste et habet malas tibias.

17 (31vb) Sequitur: *Et si quis preualuerit aduersus unum, duo resistant uni* [Eccl 4:12]. Ecce tertia, fortitudo scilicet, quia sunt plus grief a abuisier, sicut plures candele simul tardius exfinguntur.

ACENER vb.

18 (45vb) Alii uocantur nutu manus, gallice par acener idest signis creaturarum, que nobis innunt ut ad Deum properemus.

19 (80rb) Dominus nos **acene**; gallicum est.

ACESMER vb.

20 (101va) Qui hiis quatuor esset adobez et **acesmez**, non reputaretur a mundo.

ACHATER vb.

21 (28ra) Ps. [65:18] *Iniquitatem si aspexi in corde meo, non exaudiet Deus. Si redidi retribuentibus michi mala, decidam a causa merito inimicitarum ab inimicis meis inanis* [Ps 7:5] idest sine fructu et deuictus. Qui tant l'emme, tant l'achate [Hassell A 66].

ACIER s.m.

22 (25vb) Langue d'acier possemus user in clamando, quia longe a peccatoribus salus, set modo prope est inuocantibus eum idest intus in corde psallentibus.

ACOINTANCE s.f.

23 (11rb) Demones dicuntur alieni, idest estrange, a gratia et gloria; uel dicuntur alieni, quia proponunt et laborant alienare nos ab huiusmodi uel quia in eis non inuenitur privance uel familiarite uel acointance.

ACOINTIER vb.

24 (23va) Quilibet de natuitate facit l'avant uel l'ariere; ille facit l'avant qui scit se avancier de Dieu et **acointer**, sicut dicitur de homine sapiente qui habet negotium in curia. Iste homo scit soi metre avant.

ADENZ adv.

25 (28va) Set quando de oppressione filiorum tunc dicitur ibi *Surrexit* (sc. Job) [1:20] et depeca sa robe et encendra siue totondit caput suum et chai toz plaz a terre siue **adenz** in signum doloris.

ADOBER vb. See A 20.

ADRECIER vb.

26 (60vb) Nota: ad crucem s'adrecent penitentes.

27 (92ra) Scutella quam mundus adrecie sunt ista falsa solacia.

28 (101vb) Quando tu amas aliquem ad hoc ad quod Deus amat eum, habes uiam tuam adreciee ad Deum.

AFAMER vb.

29 (88ra) Item per famem fugatur dyabolus quant il est **afamez**, quia fames pellit lupum de silua [Hassell F 1; cf. Bataillon, "Similitudines et exempla," 194]. Sic etiam capitur ciuitas et reliquunt eam ciues fame coacti. Tunc est **afamez** dyabolus, quando nos abstinemus a peccato.

AFERMER vb.

30 (37va) Plagas idest peccata habent, si **affermez** et endurez et si serrez et agrevez ke riens k'en i face potest ualere.

31 (63va) Sequitur: *et firmamentum in plaga eorum* [Ps 72:4], quasi diceret, plagas habent affirmatas, gallice **affermees**, idest incurabiles.

AFERIR vb.

32 (88vb) Hereditas ista modo nos contingit **affiert** uel est escheve de iure.

33 (93vb) Nota: ideo dicit *Deus cordis mei* [Ps 72:26], quia nichil **affiert** cordi nisi Deus.

AFINER vb.

34 (64vb) Obrizum idest purum sine omni macula, gallice **affinez**.

35 (94rb) Tunc enim est finalis amor quando est purus, idest **affinez**; sicut aurum uel argentum s'**afine** in igne ab omni metallo et etiam separatur a terra, sic amor quando separatur a carne mediante fornace tribulationis uel huiusmodi s'**afine** ab omni carnalitate.

36 (101vb) Quia sicut aurum per ignem tribulationis s'**afine** de tozine tanz, sic amor Dei s'**afine** ab omni carnalitate.

AFLIRE vb.

37 (100vb) Sequitur: *Et in iustitia meditabitur* [Eccli 14:22] idest qui facit iustitiam par puerpens; discretio iustitie est in tollendo idest in auferendo le trop espargnier et le trop departir ex una parte, li trop **afflire** ex alia, quia *medium tenuere beati* [cf. Hassell, Appendix M 7], et in gallico Mesure dure [Hassell M 136; Di Stefano, p. 539].

AFOLER vb.

38 (9va) Miles quando equum suum perdit et **afole** in seruitio domini sui, honor est domini et reddit ei alium.

39 (29va) Quam reputaretur rusticus qui uideret pugilem uenientem ad se plagatum et sanguinolentum lorica fracta et equo suo **afole**. . . .

AFORER vb. A 3.

AGREVER vb. See A 30.

AHANEOR s.m.

40 (8vb) *Set qui calumpniatur egentem* [Prov 14:3], idest qui accipit eum **ahanor**, sicut uillici etc.

41 (86rb) Non uenit tanquam bachalarius cum uirga, pelee, nec quasi miles de torneamento portans lanceam sor fautre nec tanquam mercator portans trosellos ad nundinas, set uenit tanquam pauper colonus, gallice **eschennierres**, in terra nature nostre ad extirpandum et seminandum.

AIDIER vb.

42 (24rb) Ps. [70:12] *Deus, ne elongeris a me*, desaparentes moi; *Deus meus*, quasi diceret teneris, *in auxilium meum respice*, prente garde de moi **aidier**, quia bellum fort habemus.

AISIER vb.

43 (103ra) Ita caput idest conscientiam quilibet debet aiesier coxino crucis.

AIUE s.f. (cf. TL 1:229 s.v. **äie**).

44 (63vb) Bonus est ille Deus qui a par main **aiue**, set omnes illi qui ad momentum laborare noluerunt, laborabunt in eternum et uiuent adhuc in finem resumentes corpora sua et hoc in finem idest in mortem, quia semper finient et perfiniri non poterunt.

AJORNER vb.

45 (12va) Vnde per hoc ostenditur quod res magna est, pro qua oportet ita sepe **ajorner**. Si istum honorem exhibebunt inimicis, o quantum honorabit amicos.

46 (51bis rb) Sicut enim magni uiri per multas quadragenas sunt **ajorne** antequam procedatur ad eos forjugier, ita Dominus reuerentiam nobis exhibit exspectando.

ALER vb.

47 (9va) *Et obuiabit illi* etc., gallice **ira** a l'encontre, *quasi mater honorificata* [Eccli 15:2] a filiis suis, gallice comme mere ennoree, in morte scilicet, uel in presenti per gloriam conscientie que sequitur opera iustitie quasi mater honorata a filiis.

48 (26ra) *Et abiit uagus in uia cordis sui* [Is 57:17] per desideria diuersa et peccata; qui in Deo non inuenit solacium, aille males voies.

49 (34ra) Nota: Christus dicitur mulier propter amoris teneritudinem quo parturiuit nos, idest **ala** en paines, toto tempore uite sue.

ALIANCE s.f.

50 (24rb) . . . proditio est fugere a bello et relinquere dominum suum ligium, qui pro te intrauit bellum sine quo uinceras, cum quo uictor coronaberis, et conponere cum dyabolo et facere ei homagium et **alliances**.

51 (28va) Tales reprehendit apostolus, prima ad Ro. ii [Rom 1:31], homines *sine affectione, absque federe, sanz alliance*, quia nemini amore uel odio ligabantur.

ALUMER vb.

52 (54ra) Nota: carcer est obscurus, set Dominus **alume** suis, *quia mandatum lucerna est* etc. [Prov 6:23]

AMBELIR vb. = EMBELIR.

53 (99vb) Sic hylaritas decorat, **ambelist**, omnes uirtutes et facit eas placere Deo.

AME S.F.

54 (36va) Nota: sicut est de sanitate et infirmitate corporis exterius, sic de sanitate et infirmitate anime interius. Vnde sicut en termine de maladie de cors par suer, ita li terminers de la maladie de l'**amme** est par doulor.

55 (79ra) In hoc quod dicitur *ascendit* notatur debilitas *** gallice ame *** corruptibilis carnis que deprimit multum uel gratia, que in baptismo confertur, que ascendere facit, fert sursum.

AMENDER vb.

56 (28ra) Natura nos cogit d'amender illi cui forefecimus et hec est lex nature, set Christianitas cogit nos a pardonner illi qui nos a mesfait.

AMER vb. See A 21.

57 (94rb) Item *in finem dilexit eos* [Jo 13:1] idest ad bona finis, au biens ke ge li aime a la fint.

58 (95ra) Expectabitne Dominus a toi amer donec totum te habeat?

59 (101vb) Io. xv [Jo 15:12] *Hoc est preceptum meum ut diligatis inuicem, sicut dilexi uos*, idest en tele forme et manere d'amer ke je vos ai **amez**, hoc est par fin(e) amour depuree ab omni carnalitate.

AMER adj.

60 (32vb) Et plus i a de l'ammer et minus de dulci empres; li douz se passe et amarum manet in eternum: Prou. xiiii^o [14:13] *Risus dolore miscebitur*, sera des-temprez etc.

AMERTUME s.f.

61 (32vb) Vnde quia aliquis se delite et glorifie in temporalibus istis et deliciis mundi, quia uidet minus et non le plus, ipse sentit le delit et non l'amertume, quia gaudia et delicie huius mundi sunt uns buvrages destempres de dolor et dulcedo dis-temperata amaritudine.

AMONT adv.

62 (29ra) Le piez aval, le chief amont terram respiciendo, quasi diceret "o terra! ego morior pro te."

AMORS s.m. See A 59.

63 (30va) Mortem suam festinavit, quia plus nocuisset ei si adhuc unam diem expec-tasset quam totum illud quod prius passus fuerat; ita hatif erat pro liberatione nostra; amors utrageuse cogebat eum.

64 (92va) Vnde Dominus par fine amour uocat nos suum totum.

65 (94vb) Sic tu, tu diligis de fin(e) amour, si te morti temporali potius exponeres quam amicum tuum morti spirituali uel eterne exponi permetteres.

66 (102ra) Iste ignis ardet; cum bonis proximorum congaudemus et malis compati-mur, et tunc dicere possumus: d'amour me vient et li chans et li pleurs.

67 (94vb) Talis non amat de fine amour, quia cum tali non audet mori.

ANDRECIER vb. = ENDRECIER.

68 (10rb) Nota de antoner auditus et de andrecier le tuel encontre aperturam uasis per applicationem intellectus et affectus ad id quod auditur, non ad uerba detractoria, set ad liquorem pretiosum etc.

ANGOISSOS adj.

69 (52va) Angustia est in retinendo terrena, uenatio in acquirendo; secundum uulgare **angoisseus** appellantur auari.

ANTONER vb. = ENTONER. See A 68.

ANVIT adv. See ENVIS.

ANUITIER vb.

70 (10vb) Iere. xiii [13:16] *Date Deo gloriam antequam tenebrescat, anu(i)tise, in morte scilicet.*

APAIER vb.

71 (27vb) *Ecce uerbum dulce quod mittigat, gallice apaie, inimicos Eccli. vi^o [6:5].*

APAREIL s.m.

72 (68ra) Dominus de longuement fecit suum apariel contra nos. Et ideo non debemus esse pigri uel tardi de faire nostre *apariel* contra nos.

APARENTER vb.

73 (24rb) Iac. iiiii [4:8] *Apropinquate Deo, aparentez Dieu.*

APELER vb.

74 (33ra) *Venite, emite absque argento et absque ulla commutatione uinum et lac [Is 55:1], gallice j'apele ad tabernam Christi omnes qui scitiunt, quia non solum dabo eis aquam, set et uinum et lac accipient sanz rien metre.*

APENDRE vb.

75 (32ra) Hec tria fecit Dominus corporaliter propter mortuum suscitandum, corporaliter por nos apendre fremir etc. et propter spiritualem mortem anime.

APERT adj.

76 (102ra) *Deus pacis aptet uos in omni bono, quasi diceret, je pri le Deu pacis qu'il nos rende aperz et avenenz a touz biens, ut faciat uoluntatem eius [Hebr 13:20-21].*

APETICIER vb.

77 (35vb) Et sic pauperes euacuati rebus exterioribus fiunt uasa misericordie. Et de tant com il sunt plus chene et plus parfont per humilitatem, de tant recipiunt a Deo plus gratie et misericordie et citius possunt manus dyaboli euadere, quia qui plus s'apetisera uere humiliando, plus tost retia dyaboli eschapera.

78 (59va) Nota de primo signo: quanto cor se magis restringit et apetise, tanto maiorem locum facit Deo.

APRENDRE vb.

79 (20ra) Hii male docti; sic multa corda mal **apris** uolunt habere quicquid uident et cupiunt, set pueri nobilium bene edocti sedent retro ignem cum familiis, nichil petunt set accipiunt quod datur eis in pace.

80 (23va) Horrendum est mori subito, idest improuise, et ideo debe(m)us **aprendre** a morir et ponere nos in fine uite de bona uita ad bonum finem.

81 (49va) Non potest conuenienter indoctos, les mal **apris**, erudire, in cuius corde sapientia non quiescit.

APROCHIER vb.

82 (30va) *Accessistis (ad sanguinis aspersionem) etc. [Hebr 12:22,24] Vos estis aprochiez a saunc espandu.*

ARDRE, ARDOIR vb.

83 (103rb) Vnde passio Christi est quasi magna silua, in qua habemus nostrum uiuarium por ardoir ne hospitia nostra remaneant sine igne.

ARESTANCE s.f.

84 (37vb) Exemplum: quanto plus currit latro ad hartam et ad suam dampnationem et plus habet de arestanz, tant est plus fraus et fit magis pro eo.

ARESTER vb.

85 (29rb) Sic quando Dominus exit a corde, ubi s'areste super limen cordis, ecce granz jalosie.

86 (99vb) Vnde Crisostomos [cf. *Opus imperfectum in Mattheum* 5.1, 52.1 (PG 56:662, 930)]: Vel oleum, quo pugil inungitur antequam intrat in campum contra dyabolum, est misericordia. Et in tali non habet dyabolus ubi possit arester, quasi diceret, corda aspera et sicca tenentur a dyabolo, set suauiet et mitia non possunt ab eo teneri, immo li glacent extra manus.

87 (100vb) Nota quomodo quidam sistunt, s'arestent, ore ut gulosi. . . .

88 (101rb) Aliqui cauent de chars et de charretes quoniam custodiunt dechalogum, set non cauent sibi a deliciis, diuinitiis et honoribus que eos sistunt, arestent, in uia et ideo pigri, tardi in uia Domini. Et tales uadunt pedes, a pié.

ARIERE s.f. See A 24.

89 (23va) De illis qui faciunt l'arriere et non l'avant, tales faciunt aduentum Anti-christi.

ARIEREGARDE s.f.

90 (14va) Multi faciunt l'arrieregarde, ut illi qui semper elongant se: Iere. [cf. Jer 2:5] facti sunt in retro et non in ante.

ARIVER vb.

91 (54ra) Nota quomodo nauis eleuatur a uento et eliditur ad scopulum. Nota quod periculum est a l'arriver.

ARREER vb.

92 (98rb) Septimum est prudentia siue prouidentia que *arree* hospitium; tunc est bene arreez quando res sunt in loco suo.

ARTUISON s.m.

93 (48va) Ysa. xiiii^o [14:11] *Subter te sternetur tynæa*, gallice tegne uel *artuisons*, ecce culcitra, et *operimentum tuum erunt uermes*, ecce opertorium, gallice covertoirs.

ASSAUT s.m.

94 (93ra) Secundo sensualitas fatigata quasi consentit, sicut obsessi aliquando fatigantur en *assaut*.

ASSAUTER vb.

95 (37va) Statim quando morbus assaut hominem, debet querere medicum idest confiteri sacerdoti.

ASSAVORER vb.

96 (8ra) Expone auctoritatem propositam *Deus autem patientie et solacii*, ut supra, *det uobis id ipsum sapere* [Rom 15:5], hoc ad sacramentum altaris, gallice une meime viande assavorer, ut ille idem morcellus qui transit per os corporis transeat per os cordis [cf. Morawski, p. 68, no. 1860].

97 (49ra) Adde de epulatore domigeroso, dongereus, qui cibos non bene **assavorez**, conditos, reicit in faciem seruitoris.

ASSEOIR vb.

98 (10va) Rapsaces dyabolus qui habet assis corda in hoc mundo.

99 (27rb) Ps. [38:4] *In meditatione mea exardescit ignis*; hec est puritas conscientie *assis* le blanc sor le vermel, *gratis ac nitentibus oculis* [Esth 15:8], clers et avenenz puritas intentionis..

ASSÉUREMENT s.m.

100 (93ra) Sexto confidentia et asseuremenz de auxilio.

ASSÉURER vb.

101 (98ra) Nota: timor uigil est hospitii, unde suum officium est hospitem asseurer.

ASSOAGIER vb.

102 (37ra) Et ex quo homo mittigatur de dire les maladies de son cors amicis suis, qui etiam non possunt consilium adhibere, bien doit estre assuagiez de dire a Deu infirmitates cordis sui, qui seit et uult et potest nos iuuare.

ASSOMER vb.

103 (34rb) Io. xix^o [19:30] *Consummatum est, assummez*, sicut compotus est *assummez*.

ATACHIER vb.

104 (59va) Ista signa affixa sunt, gallice athachie, in recta intentione.

105 (60vb) Crux posita fuit in uia, quando crux Christo fuit applicata, gallice attachie.

ATAILLIER vb. Godefroi 1:460

106 (34vb) *Quid ultra potui* etc. [Is 5:4] plantaui uerbo predicationis, rigaui sanguine passionis, sepiui idest clausi custodia angelorum, paxillaui, escharconne, exemplo sanctorum, stercoraui, fiembre, multitudine benefactorum, putaui, je l'ataille, falce, de la sarpe, flagellorum.

ATAINDRE vb.

107 (62va) *Persequar* [Ps 17:38] inuestigando et de peccatis cogitando et de ipsis dolendo; tunc est gallice atainz inimicus, non conuertitur donec deficiant perseuerando.

108 (95rb) *Comprehendam eos* [Ps 17:38] scilicet de ipsis dolendo; tunc est gallice inimicus atainz.

ATARGIER vb.

109 (37va) Vnde quanto cor, idest anima, plus est quam est corpus, tanto grauiora et periculosiora sunt vulnera, idest peccata cordis, ad sanandum interius quam vulnera corporis exterius et peius est peccatoribus li atargiers.

ATEMPRER vb.

110 (8ra) Nota quomodo a corde incipere debemus et atemprer cordas vielle.

ATENDRE vb.

111 (30va) Eccli. iii^o [Eccl 3:7] *Est tempus loquendi et tempus tacendi*; sic Christus in cruce loquutus est delivrement et non coram balliuis, quia non respondit eis ut ne triast nostram redemptionem, quia li atendres fuissest ei plus detroiz que li soffriris.

112 (44rb) *Redimentes tempus* [Eph 5:16], sicut peregrinus qui uult expectare, atandre, socios suos.

ATENDRIR vb.

113 (94vb) Exemplum de patre ituro in peregrinationem, qui atenrist erga familiam suam.

AUTRE pron. indef.

114 (19vb) Et quia *praua* [Lc 3:5] idest corda prauorum distorta per inuidiam, quia inuidus respicit autre avers, bona alterius.

AUTRUI pron.

115 (24va) Ante incarnationem erat Dominus remotus a nobis, sicut principium a fine, caput a cauda, set coniunctum est principium fini etc. Nota quod plurium est dampnator quam saluator, et tamen uocatur nomine saluatoris, quia alienum est opus eius ab eo. Vnde qui intromittit se d'autrui mestier, il i desavient.

116 (35vb) Rete dicitur a retinendo; de ce que tu retiens de autrui, es tu retenuz a diabolo.

117 (51bis vb) Illi sunt qui d'autrui se chatoient, sicut dicitur equus quadrigarius sonitu uirge.

118 (91vb) Dicitur vulgariter, quando homo non operatur et nichil retinet, qu'il regarde a autrui main.

AVAL adj. See A 62.

AVALER vb.

119 (92rb) Prisio peccator qui manet in peccato; qualibet die a parfundist unum pedem terre et quanto plus manet in hoc carcere, tanto plus a parfundist, ita quod in fine est ita *avalez* et carcer ita profundus quod non potest homo exire par desesperence.

120 (92rb) Nota: corda quam Dominus a *avalee* ad nos extrahendum de carcere, idest de peccato, est memoria et la souvenance passionis sue.

AVANCEMENT s.m.

121 (21ra) Item vulgariter dicitur: Dyabolus l'a bien charrié. Hii currus Pharaonis, hii currus ***. Equus dignitas temporalis id quod seculum appellat *avencement*.

122 (97va) Ysa. lvii [57:15] *Habitans in contrito et humili <spiritu> ut uiuificit spiritum humili et uiuificit cor contritorum* secundum quod homo minus querit suum honorem et exaltationem, gallice *avencement*. . . .

AVANCIER vb. See A 24.

AVANT prep. See A 24.

123 (93ra) Tertio ratio aduertens da(m)pnus suum non uult consentire; hec est conscientia que li met avant sua dampna.

AVANTAGE s.m.

124 (37vb) Illis (sc. diuitibus) penitentia non iniungitur nec etiam accusantur, quia timetur potestas eorum nec hec est libertas, quia non reprehenduntur, nisi eundi ad infernum et *avantages* de estre penduz a gybellum inferni.

AVANTGARDE s.f.

125 (51bis rb) Hoc autem fit per timorem qui facit l'avantgarde in reconciliatione et reuersione ad Deum.

AVANTPARLIER s.m.

126 (67vb) Nota quod habes duos *avant-parliers*, scilicet os et gemitum.

AVENANT adj. (cf. Godefroi 1:515). See A 76; A 99.

AVILER vb.

127 (9rb) *Qui autem contempnunt me* etc. [1 Sam 2:30] hoc ad superbiam, quasi diceret, qui m'avilent, ego uilificabo eos. Cil **avile** Deu qui dimittit eum pro minori quam ualeat.

AVOIR vb. See A 114.

128 (20ra) Nota: familia sensuum mala est quam debemus prope tenere ne euagentur; semper petunt et appetunt sicut mali pueri in domo. Unus petit panem, alius carnes. Nota: pueri rusticorum ponunt in scutella sua et uolunt de tot avoir.

129 (30va) Luc. xiif [12:50] *Baptismo habeo baptizari: et <quomodo> coartor usque-dum perficiatur?* Glossa *baptismo* idest morte. Baptismus intinctio dicitur. Sic hic sanguis, quasi diceret, d'une mort ai a morir.

130 (33va) Vnde *Malum est, malum est, dicit omnis emptor* [Prov 20:14]; quando scilicet sustinet temptationes cordis et tribulationes corporis, uidetur ei graue et cara mercatura. Set in redditu de la foire, in morte scilicet, quando erit en saisine et de l'avoir, tunc tenet denariatas caras et iuratum est.

131 (35va) *Deus, propitius esto michi peccatori:* Luc. xg [18:13]: Domine deus, aies de moi merci, qui peccator sum.

132 (35vb) Et quanto plus retines, plus as devvelopemenz in reti dyaboli ad te retinendum et plus i es antouilliez ne possis inuenire les mailles rethis ad euadendum.

133 (37rb) Modo tempus est ostendendi uulnra idest peccata qui le cuer unt navre.

134 (65ra) Vnde Deus posuit omnia iura nobis ke l'en puet avoir d'entrer en possession rei alicuius in introitu regni.

B

BAIART s.m.

1 (10ra) Item qui disciplinate uiuit, honorat Deum, eum in hospitio honesto recipiendo, non en baiart cum ribaldis.

BAILLIE s.f.

2 (9rb) Nota quomodo prelati sunt quasi ballui Domini, qui habent animas en baillie [cf. B. Hauréau, *Notices et extraits* 2:185]; oportebit eos reddere rationem.

BAS adj.

3 (23rb) Qui ex amore operatur, alta uia incedit; qui solo timore plus bas.

BATEOR s.m.

4 (100ra) Et ubi plures flagellantes, bateour, ibi est citius batu.

BATRE vb. See B 4.

BEAL adj.

5 (100ra) Roba exterior est corporis bona conuersatio, quando homo est de **beal** deport et de **bail** maintien.

BEANCE s.f.

6 (97ra) Nota etiam quod qui uult gratiam et consolationem puisier, oportet ad Dominum uertere la baance et intrutionem cordis. Exemplum de fundo olle et ore eius.

BEER vb.

7 (56ra) Gyon qui interpretatur hyatus terre spectat ad spem; sicut uas dicitur hyare, gallice baer, ita spes erga futuram beatitudinem cor inhyare facit.

8 (92ra) Ille se habet ut expectans qui bee ad hoc quod non habet et se consirre a rebus quas habet, siue bee ad ea que non uidet et se consirre a rebus quas uidet, siue **〈bee〉** ad res que sunt supra et se consirre ab inferioribus rebus.

BERGIERE s.f.

9 (77rb) O quam humiliata est filia regis, que facta est bergeiere, de uilla campestri sequendo delectationes sensuum.

BERGERIE s.f.

10 (77rb) Sodales sensus nostri sunt quorum greges, gallice **bergeries**, sunt obiecta sensuum in quibus ipsi sensus delectantur, oculi in coloribus, gustus in saporibus, auris in rumoribus et sic de aliis.

BESCUIRE vb. (cf. Godefroi 1:632).

11 (104ra) Hic bis coctus, bescuiz, in utero beate uirginis igne spiritus sancti.

BESOGNE s.f.

12 (24vb) Secundo prope est loco per presentiam ut diligentius faciamus opus suum, **sa besogne**, spe premii gaudentes.

13 (25ra) Totum hoc est in saluo in bursa sua, in qua qui nichil ponit, nichil accipit. Nota de credentiis et quomodo bursa aperta ad accipiendum et reponendum es-parne maaille jeke a la **besogne**.

BESOING s.m.

14 (24rb) Nota quomodo accepit terram a nobis ut esset fidelis noster et homo et man-sionarius et non posset nobis deesse au **besoig**, si monitus fuerit.

15 (104vb) Ps. [88:29] *In eternum seruabo illi misericordiam*, quasi diceret, non ex-pendam misericordiam in presenti, set seruabo au **besoig**, quia sicut miseretur pater filiorum, misertus est Dominus timentibus se.

BIEN adv. See A 102.

16 (21ra) Item uulgariter dicitur: Dyabolus l'a **bien** charrié.

17 (99rb) Sic est de illo qui intendit a **bien** prechier et non a faire quod ipse predicat.

BIEN s.m. See A. 57; A 76.

18 (30vb) Lazarus languidus est spiritus tenuis in amore Dei, qui habet defectum feruoris et piger est en entrep(r)endre les **biens** a faire et impatiens a mal soffrir.

19 (36ra) Porreta: qui timet Deum, facit sa demorance en **biens** permenanz et son tre-pas in bonis transitorii uel transeuntibus.

20 (84vb) Wlgariter: Qui le **bien** voit et le mal prent, il se fet tort a esciaent [cf. Morawski, p. 68, no. 1852].

21 (92vb) Pusillanimitas est fallance et lassetez et petitesce cordis et pigritia d'entre-prendre les **biens** a faire et de parsivre bonum quod habemus entrepris et im-patientia ad malum patiendum.

BLANC adj. See A 99.

BLASMER vb.

22 (96vb) Nota: bursa tabernarii habet duas plicas et diuersas monetas. Sic cor illius qui ante prise et retro **b(l)ame**; non sic Dominus.

BOBANT s.m. (cf. Godefroi 1:668a s.v. bobert).

23 (86va) Non enim exiens a patre uenit ad nos in hunc mundum quasi nouus miles uadens cum magna pompa, gallice **boben**, ad torneamentum nec sicut diues mer-

cator cum multis trosellis ad nundinas, set quasi unus colonus uel arator, gallice gaaignierres de terre.

24 (90rb) Nobiles multi phaleran a bruit et a **bobant** et cum gaudio magno a tabors et a flageux solent uenire ad torneamenta, qui postea a torneamento multos ictus et colees reportant uituperati et desmontee.

BOCHE s.f.

25 (27va) Verba enim de Deo sunt, uerba Dei par quelque vaissel quele soint reesgies idest de cui boche queles soiait dites siue bonorum siue malorum.

26 (44Vb) Prov. xixo [19:1] *Melior est pauper, qui ambulat in simplicitate sua, quam diues torquens labia sua* mentiendo, detrahendo **boche** torse [cf. Morawski, p. 86, no. 2382], os recedens a corde, quando aliud dicit, aliud cogitat.

BÖE s.f.

27 (92ra) *Et de luto fecis* [Ps 39:3], quasi diceret, il m'a trait fors de la boe et de la lie. BON adj.

28 (36ra) Porreta: In presenti uerberat nos gracili baculo, set in futuro de grosso, gallice **bon** fait souffrir la graille pur eschapper le gros.

29 (37ra) Ecclesia in seruitio hodierno ramentoit Dieu ses bones costumes recipiendi a merci illos qui merci uolunt habere.

BONE s.f.

30 (19va) Exemplum de ribaldo qui tulit metas, gallice les **bonnes**, ut suscitaret discordiam.

BORDE s.f.

31 (59vb) Vbique relinquamus signa letitie nostre. Hoc est signum de **borde** large.

BOTEILLIER s.m.

32 (12ra) Dedit enim carnem suam in cibum, sanguinem in potum, quasi diceret, seruuit ad mensam tanquam panetarius et uinarius idest **botelliers** uel quasi coqus: Ps. [64:10] *Parasti cibum illorum.*

BOTEILLERIE s.f.

33 (12ra) Altare est paneterie et **botell(e)rie** ecclesie.

BOTER vb.

34 (33ra) Iob iii^o [3:8] *Qui parati sunt suscitare Leuiatan.* Item impulsu par sachier et par boter ut letargici.

BRISIER vb.

35 (61ra) Nota de extensione tibie per peccatum et delectationem. Nota del brisier; tunc religatur cum dolore et facilius refringitur et quando tardatur religatio, caro nascitur entre deux et tunc periculum est.

BRO, BREU s.m.

36 (20ra) Quidam non mutauerunt, set adhuc tenent se a **breu** sicut porcus.

BROCHE s.f.

37 (33vb) Vnde infra octo dies fuit afforatum, sicut precones uini portant cyphum et potum et dant a essay, set in die passionis fuit uinum positum a **broche** ex omni parte.

BRUIT s.m. See B 24

BUVRAGE s.m. See A 61.

C

CENSER vb.

1 (28rb) Sequitur: *Abstine te a lite* [Eccli 28:10], suffre toi et consirre toi de censer.
CEP s.m.

2 (14vb) Act. xxvi^o [Act 16:19] Paulus et Sylas incarcerati et pedibus eorum astrictis in ligno idest in cippo, gallice **cep**, erant adorantes Dominum pro hiis beneficiis reddentes gratias.

3 (23vb) *In omni seductione iniquitatis* [2 Th 2:10], quia obseruat son **cep** et eis qui melius seruunt peius soluit *hiis qui pereunt*.

CHAITIF adj. See C 20.

CHALONGIER vb.

4 (88va) Nota quod homo qui debet recipere inuestituram de terra uel de aliquo alio per scabinos et litteras, multum festinat ne alius possit reclamare, **chalongier**.

CHAMBERIERE s.f.

5 (97rb) Ratio seruit et est chamberiere fidei.

CHAMPION s.m.

6 (83ra) Tunc Ysaac idest Deus pater dedit nobis absolutionem, postquam Iacob luctator noster, gallice **champions**, idest Christus, obtulit ei in cruce duos hedos *quibus libenter uestitur* [Gen 27:9].

CHANÇON s.f.

7 (26vb) Ps. [148:14] *Hymnus, chancons, omnibus sanctis eius: sine terra populo apropinquanti sibi.*

CHANGIER vb.

8 (90va) Peccator qui **change** suum statum uadit obuiam Christo, quia uadit de loco uitii ad locum uirtutis, de loco in quo erat ad locum in quo non erat.

9 (105va) Testimonio fidei probati inuenti sunt sancti *ludibria et uerbera experti* etc. [Hebr 11:36], quando certum est testimonium quod in tribulacione redditur et non mutatur quacumque aduersitate, gallice ne se **change** mie.

CHANT s.m. See A 66.

10 (51vb) Hanc non fecit Deus angelo superbienti, immo statim de **chant en chant** uindictam sumpsit de eo.

CHANTEPOLE s.f.

11 (90rb) Sic Christus hodie cum honore receptus est a Iudeis, set de hoc honore facto sibi hodierno die soluit symbolum, l'escot, feria sex^{ta}; unde hodie est la **chantepleore** ecclesie, quia hodie siue eodem die quo honoratus fuit, fuit tractatum de morte sua.

12 (98vb) Vnde hodie est la **chantepleore** ecclesie, quia ecclesia luctum miscet gaudio, unde altaria sunt denudata, set seruitum misse est de gaudio resurrectionis.

13 (105va) Pe. 1 [1 Petr 1:6] *In quo scilicet Christo exultabit, modicum nunc si[cut] contristari oportet in uariis temptationibus, ceste chantepleure exultat in conscientia et contristatur in carne.*

CHAPERON s.m.

14 (23rb) Sic Stephanus: *Ecce uideo celos apertos* etc. [Act 7:55]. Non sic mundus, immo tegit oculos caputio et uertit qua parte uult. Nota de ludo au chaperon.

CHARAI s.m.

15 (59ra) Nota: a principio commisit Deus signa sua homini, gallice **charai**, quando fecit eum ad ymaginem et similitudinem suam, set signum istud deiectum fuit in paradyso terrestri, quia ad primum torneamentum deiectus fuit Adam et ideo descendit in terra Deus ad reueandum signum suum.

CHARGIER vb.

16 (96rb) Veritas etiam oris est quando os dicit illud quod cor li **charche**.

CHARNIER s.m.

17 (91ra) Item non debet Dominus proici o **charnier** cum pauperibus qui quandoque integri proiciuntur.

CHARETTE s.f. See A 88.

CHARREE s.m. See A 88.

CHARRIER s.m. (cf. Godefroi 2:72b s.v. charier).

18 (20vb) Auriga dyabolus qui facit eum uersare in priori loco et **charrier** sor estot.

CHARRIERE s.f.

19 (22vb) Semita idest pedestribus idest humi(il)bus peruia; equis et curribus est lata uia in profundis, gallice **charrieres**, ubi rote profundantur et procedere non ualent.

CHARTRE s.f.

20 (92ra) *Et eduxit me de lacu miserie* [Ps 39:2–3], et il me gita fors de la parfun de **chartre**, ubi li cheitif pomuntur.

CHASCUN pron.

21 (27rb) Hest. ultimo [Esth 15:4] *Die tertio post exercit(i)um penitentie tripertite depositum uestimenta ornatus sui, de chascun jor idest exercitium polyticarum uirtutum que ordinant ad proximum.*

CHASTIER vb. See A 117.

22 (28vb) Nota: iste latro quinque fecit quibus homo ordinatus est ad Deum, ad se et ad proximum. Socium increpauit, **chatia**, ibi *neque tu times Deum* [Lc 23:40], ecce castigatio.

CHASTOIRE s.f.

23 (16rb) Sic usurarii comedunt labores aliorum, set in fine eicientur et in exitu ab alueolo, gallice **chatuire**, quilibet pauperum spoliatorum feriet ibi ictum suum.

CHATEL s.m.

24 (25va) Si sciret illos qui non inuenientur in ea teneri sub interdicto mortis inferni, cogitaret etim per ciquex **chatiex** esset querela.

CHAUDE n. f.

25 (28ra) *Nocenti te* [Eccli 28:2] dicitur en **chaudes**, quando il te nuit, non postquam nocuerit, quia in illo puncto qu'il te mesfait idest statim quando les plaies sunt novelles idest li mesfait novel li doiz pardonner, quia est difficilus.

CHAUFOR s.m.

26 (10ra) Sic lapides tormentis resoluti sunt in Stephano qui fuit quasi uns **chausfors**.

CHÈANCE s.f.

27 (67va) Modo est tempus et la saisons et la **cheance** lucrandi totum uel perdendi totum.

CHEMIN s.m.

28 (44vb) Nota quomodo illi qui gaitent les **chemins** de facili permittunt transire pau-
peres.29 (100vb) Sic nos intramus le **chemyn** paradisi.

CHENE s.f. See A 77.

CHENILLE s.f.

30 (89vb) Vermes, scilicet les **chenilles**, et florem excutit cum uermibus.

CHÉOIR, CHÄER vb. See A 25.

CHEVAL s.m.

31 (96vb) Et uulgariter dicitur: **Cheval** a parcon comedunt li wagon.32 (101rb) Et propter hoc Dominus ad honorandum eos mittit eis equos tribulationis
pour translater in celum et haster la journee, quia qui uadit eques, a **cheval**, citius
uadit et hos equos nos livre Dominus quando immittit tribulationes, que portant
cor.

CHEVAUCHÉOR s.m.

33 (13ra) Sic Dominus paucos habet equites, gallice **chevaucheurs**.

CHEVEZ s.m.

34 (90ra) *Proicies te a parte pedum et ibi iacebis* [Ruth 3:4] per contemplationem
scilicet conceptam a Christi humanitate quod est contra illos qui a parte capitis, do
chevet, uolunt intrare lectum, ut illi qui a diuinitate incipiunt.

CHEVIR vb.

35 (28rb-va) Nota: fuerunt philosophi qui non tantum bene laborabant ad hoc quod
neminem diligenter quantum ad hoc neminem odirent. Non erant *** nec de
amicis nec de inimicis, quia ad hoc erant ducti quod non mouebantur prosperitate
nec stupebant aduersitate; semper erant in eodem puncto; numquam se **chevioient**
nec gaudium amicorum les elecoit nec tristitia les abatoit.

CHIEF s.m. See A 62.

CHIER adj.

36 (66va) Bis dicit trop est chier de laissier id quod placet et d'entreprendre id quod
dispicet carni, scilicet dimittere uitia et arripere uirtutes.

CHOSE s.f.

37 (79va) Vnde notandum quod semper li hordemenz de mollibus fit, gallice de
soples choses et plaisanz, et absorbet ictus contra petrariam uel mangonellum uel
contra aliam machinam dyaboli, ut detractionem, uel aliam persecutionem.

CISEL s.m.

38 (98vb) Locus enim in quo sepultus est Dominus fuit entaillez a **cisiax** in petra et
per hoc cor intelligitur, quod rumpit et mollificat rupem et duritiam suam per
memoriam, la sovenance, passionis Christi. Vnde Dominus moriendo fabricauit
foriales **cisiax**, quibus duritia cordis rumpitur, quia memoria passionis eius non est
aliud nisi **cisiax** ad rumpendum cordis duritiam.

CLARTÉ s.f.

39 (97rb) Vnde fides seruit in hospitio cordis Christo de clarte siue luminari.

CLER adj. See A 99.

COI adj.

40 (17va) Iob xiii^o [13:21] *Manus tuas longe fac a me* idest tene manus tuas coies.
 41 (56ra) Vel aliter Tygris rapidus idest rades, quia cito currit; sunt honores mundi,
 quia tales homines rigidiores sunt. Quando sunt simplices, monachi sunt quasi
 aque Syloe, aque coies.

COING s.f.

42 (79vb) Mone(t)a est penitentia, que in contritione tanquam in cuneo, gallice **coig**,
 formatur et debet esse de puro metallo idest de puro corde.

COLEE s.f. See B 24.

COMPAGNIE s.f.

43 (15ra) Osee xi [11:4] *In funiculis Adam* etc. Christus autem uoluit cum ipso ligari
 uinculis eiusdem par **companie**.

COMPERE s.m.

44 (80va) Et dixit Renardo: “**Compere**, ego nescio quid habeo.” Et ille respondit: “Au
 rendre le sauras.” [cf. Morawski, p. 88, no. 2438].

CONDUIT s.m.

45 (54va) Hec enim pluuiia dyabolum et potestatem eius submersit *quasi fluuius Borix*
et quasi aqueductus, idest **conduiz**, *exiui de paradys* [Eccli 24:41].

CONFANNONIER s.m. = GONFANONIER.

46 (59ra) *Ego stigmata Domini Ihesu in corpore meo porto*: Gal. ultimo [6:17]. Verba
 sunt marescalli et domini **confannonier**...

CONFORT s.m.

47 (10va) Nota: dyaboli consolatores sunt honerosi: Iob xvi [Jb 16:2] *Consolatores*
honerosi omnes uos estis, quasi diceret, uos facitis samblant de moi conforter
 delectationem peccati proponendo et tamen vos **confors** m'est a fais.

CONFORTER vb. See C 47.

48 (36rb) *Mulier, quid ploras?* [Jo 20:13] Bene sciebat quare, set querebat ut eam magis
 ad plorandum prouocaret, car ele se **confortoit** en plorant et plorora en **confortant**.

CONIN s.m. (cf. TL 2:693.47–49).

49 (92vb) Maritus quandoque se defigurat in habitu extraneo ad uidendum les **conines**
 [counies MS] sue uxoris.

CONQUERRE vb.

50 (37ra) Sequitur: *Qui autem confessus fuerit, et reliqu(er)it ea, misericordiam con-*
sequetur [Prov 28:13], idest **conquerra**.

51 (37rb) *misericordiam consequetur*, idest **conquerra**.

CONROI s.m.

52 (46va) Nota quod pauperes currunt ualde celeriter ad portam diuitis, quando debent
 habere le **conroi** idest refectionem unius diei et multum est debilis et infirmus qui
 illuc non properat.

CONSIRER vb. See C 1; B 8.

53 (9rb) Hii leuant emendas in correptionibus capituli, a quibus nos libenter abstine-
 mus, nos **consirrons** [consirrons MS].

CONSIRREE s.f. (cf. Godefroi 2:253b s.v. *consiree*).

54 (92ra) Sic multi iejunando exspectant hospites suos, sic multas **consirrees** [consirrees MS] oportet nos facere.

CONTRAIT adj.

55 (17va) Ci redrecent li **contret** petit elemosinam ab introeuntibus [cf. Act 3:3], quando sufficientia sanctorum implorat.

COP s.m.

56 (47rb) Hinc baptizato Domino in Iordane apertum est celum, quia tales sine **cop** ferir intrant paradysum etc.

CORDE s.f.

57 (88vb) Hec hereditas distribuitur in funiculo distributionis a verge et a **corde**, quia pluribus diuiditur.

58 (92va) Nota de Raab meretrice, Iosue ii [2:1], que saluata fuit et omnis domus eius per signum funiculi coccinei idest **corde** vermeille et rouge.

COREEMENT adv. (cf. Godefroi 2:302a).

59 (34va) Ysa. xlvi [42:2] *Non clamabit nec audietur uox eius foris*, set semper core-
ment et dulciter locutus est.

CORGIEE s.f.

60 (71vb) Deffert secum peccator les **corgies** quibus flagellatur scilicet labore in peccata faciendo et recessionem a Deo, que est amara ualde . . . et subiectionem dyaboli, terminum dampnationis et incertitudinem resurgendi a peccato mortis, recordationem et pene expectationem uel hic uel alibi. Hec sunt les **corgies** quibus dyabolus tanquam summularius flagellat peccatorem plus quam asinos ad pontem.

CORS s.m. See A 54; A 102.

61 (27ra) De sitiente et bibente auide dicitur gallice li **cors** li requiert.

62 (52ra) Nota de denariis recopez et retailliez qui sunt repentence [repentende MS]
de cuer et penitance de cors.

COSTUME s.f. See B 29.

COUTRE s.m.

63 (86rb) Ante debet ager scindi cultro siue per dentale, gallice **coutre**, contritionis et debet ager uerti, gallice estre versee, uomere confessionis.

COVERTOIR s.m. See A 93.

CRAISSE s.f.

64 (52vb) Bestie de saison non sunt pauperes, set diuites. Nota de ceruis de **craisse**.

CREVER vb.

65 (96va) Wlgariter dicitur de muro: ubi parietes creverent et se dessievrent, hoc opus se desment.

cri s.m.

66 (31vb) *Lazare, ueni foras* [Jo 11:43], gallice il fremi, il se trobla, plora et cria a grant **cri**: Ladres, is fors.

CRIER vb. See C 66.

67 (36va) Modo est la saisons de merci **crier**, quia in futuro non exaudientur clamantes.

CROIE s.f.

68 (21va) Nota: quidam sunt sicut terra de **croie**, que non est bibula.

69 (53va) Bona carnis sunt insipida, quia putrida nec talia saporem conferunt nisi palatis male dispositis, febricitantibus et pregnantibus. Istis sapiunt creta, idest de **croie**, carbones et huiusmodi.

CROIRE vb.

70 (8rb) Honorificat Deum qui se desment pur Deu **croire**.

71 (8rb) Set qui tantum tenet de me quod intelligit et credit quod non uidet et desment sensus suos por moi **croire**, facit michi honorem.

CROISSIER vb.

72 (69va) Sic Dominus, karissimi, manus habet uersatiles, sicut dicitur Cant. [Cant 5:14], eo quod faciliter cancellantur, gallice sunt **craisies**, ut qui per honores et bona temporalia ad dextram uidentur esse in presenti, in futuro inueniant se in sinistra, cum ad sinistram statuentur.

CROIZ s.f.

73 (34va) Set Christus summam, la **crosse**, soluit pro omnibus, quia omnes penas trossauit super lignum et ideo non restabat nisi per mortem transitus. Sicut quando trossati sunt summarii nobilium, transeunt post eos omnia membra, pedes, latus, oculi. Flementes habuerunt summam suam de penis.

CROLIERE s.f.

74 (23ra) Nota de illis qui uadunt par les **crolières** quando non credunt habere doumaces, usque ad cauillam pedis cadunt, aliquando usque ad renes.

CUEILLIR vb. (cf. Godefroi 2:392).

75 (100vb) Nota: si aliquis uocaretur ad regnum recipiendum et descenderet pour **ceillir** feves et huiusmodi, posset dici quod oblitus esset illud ad quod uocaretur uel quod stultus esset.

CUER s.m. See A 133; C 62.

76 (32va) Dominus ostendet simplicem uultum bonis et malis, set rea conscientia non poterit uultum sufferre car li **cuers** li ***.

77 (36rb) Loquitur tanquam reus qui petit recipi a pais et a merci en repentence de cuer.

78 (36va) Ps. [36:4] *Dabo tibi petitiones cordis tui car li quers requiert se qu'il desire.*

79 (86vb) Aratrum pungens et scindens terram est dolor de peccato qui pungit cor penitentie, gallice il li point au cuer.

CUIRE vb.

80 (13ra) Ysa. xlivi [43:2] *Cum transieris per aquas, flumina non operiant te;* per aquas falsa asperitas que dissoluit *cum ambula<ue>ris in igne* etc; per ignem aduersitas que urit, gallice **cuit**.

CUTURE s.f.

81 (50vb) Cum autem pro peccato originali circum<ci>sio antiquitus fieret in populo Dei, Christus circumcisionem sustinuit, licet peccatum non haberet, ad similitudinem cauterie, **culture** gallice, que in membro sano fieri consueuit ut dolorem membra infirmi attrahat.

CYESTE s.f.

82 (17ra) Secundo cauilla qua eruuntur oculi est odium eorum que non debent odiri, ut bona proximorum per inuidiam. Ita excecantur de claritate, de parentela sicut auis que gallice dicitur **cyeste**. Vnde Hely non poterat uidere lucernam Domini.

D

DANGEROS adj. See A 97.

DECÈVANCE s.f.

1 (97rb) Et ista demonstratur leur **deceavance** fausetez.

DECLIN s.m.

2 (105vb) Superbi dicuntur declinantes, quia uadunt ad **declin**.

DECLOS adj.

3 (59va) Nota quomodo Christus fuit natus in angustia frigoris in domo **declose**, gallice hale, et media nocte quando alii dormiunt.

DEDUISANT part. (cf. TL 2:1269. 26 s.v. deduire).

4 (50va) Vnde Rebecca Gen. [24:25] Est *locus spatirosus* apud nos. . . . Vel **spatirosus** idest esbenoianz et dedusanz secundum quod dicitur spatiari.

DEJETEMENT s.m. (cf. Godefroi 2:472a).

5 (36va) Et sicut sudor ad hoc ut terminet infirmitatem debet esse in omnibus membris, non in pede tantum uel in capite etc., ita dolor siue contritio debet esse generalis de omnibus peccatis et sicut motus et **degitemenz** tollit sudorem, sic inquietudo eundi et exeundi etc.

DELIT s.m. See A 61.

DELITIER vb. See A 61.

6 (99ra) Et quamuis corpus requiescat aliquando in rebus qui li **delitent** exterius, conscientia tamen laborat interius.

DELIVRE adj.

7 (32ra) Vnde illi sunt franc et **delivre** qui sibi cauent a peccatis.

DELIVREMENT s.m. See A 111.

DELIVRER vb.

8 (37rb) Et est talis diuisio inter curiam Dei et mundi, quia qui confitetur peccatum suum coram iudice mundiali condempnatur et morti adiudicatur, set qui coram Deo, absoluuntur et est **delivres** a morte.

9 (100va) Nota de reuocatione sententie mortis per alias litteras: Iere. xxxi [31:2] *Inuenit gratiam in deserto populus*; derelictus idest **delivrez** gladio fuit genus humananum; gladius est pena, mors etc..

DEMORANCE s.f. See B 19.

DEMOREE s.f.

10 (100vb) Eccli. xiiif. [14:22] *Beatus uir qui in sapientia morabitur*, faciet sa **demoree**.

DEPARTIR vb. See A 37.

11 (36ra) *Ite maledicti in ignem eternum* [Mt 25:41], quia sicut li tranchant **depart** unam partem ab alia, sic sententia Domini separabit bonos a malis.

DEPASSER vb.

12 (91ra) Sunt qui uestimenta huiusmodi sternunt super conculcantes, gallice **depassee**.

DEPORT s.m. See B 5.

DEPORTER vb.

13 (9va) *Continens* [Eccli 15:1] idest similis de omnibus tenet, hoc est perfecte secundum uulgare, uel ex omni parte non est iustitia perfecta parcere uni, gallice **depor**ter, et suspendere alium.

DEPURER vb. See A 59.

DERAISNIER vb.

14 (30va) Item in cruce loquutus est pur derainier ius nostrum. Item noluit *derainier* coram eis, quia non erat de iurisdictione eorum.

15 (37vb) Sic pauperes plures habent arestatores et retentatores, qui les *derainent* a uia inferni, set diuites habent auantagium eundi in infernum, quia non retinentur reprehensionibus et huiusmodi.

16 (68ra) Et li forjura Dominus son eritage donec ueniret qui eius causam assumeret, set, quia per inobedientiam lesarat diuinam maiestatem, que maior est omni eo quod est in celo et in terra uel potest esse, non potuit causam istam assumere nisi maior omni creatura, quia uero non potuit esse pro eo por restorer et deraisnier cest esritaige nisi qui de cognatione sua esset uel proximus.

17 (68rb) Ipse [sc. Christus] enim est miles ad cignum qui *deraigna* hereditagium uidue domine.

DESAPARENTER vb. = DESAPAROIR? (cf. TL 2:1464). See A 42.

DESAVENIR vb. See A 115.

DESCENDRE vb.

18 (90va) Nota: multi sunt hospites, gallice ostelier, qui recipiunt hospites, et quando sunt *descendu* et deshosie et mantice destrossate, si crederent plus lucrari in recipiendo alios quam istos, eicerent et hoc est traasons.

DESCOMBRER vb.

19 (49vb) Nota: humilitas euacuat, idest *decombe*, hospitium cordis ab illo magno encombrier proprie uoluntatis, quando homo querit proprium honorem suum et proprium comodum.

20 (50va) Nota hospitium clarum per fidem, *descombree* per humilitatem, pacificum per pacem, securum per timorem, mundum per confessionem, munitum idest garniz per prudentiam, spatiostum per patientiam.

21 (79ra) In hoc nota: amotio impedimenti, quia tales sine ictu feriendo habent paradoxum, quia Dominus soluit pro eis symbolum, gallice l'escot, et habent uiam *descombree*.

22 (87ra) Solet dici quod ille facit bonam dietam qui de fol se *descombe*, set meliorrem dietam facit qui se liberat de iniquo peccato scilicet intus dyabolo [Morawski, p. 10, no. 276; Bataillon and Bériou, “G. de Mailly,” 44].

DESCOVRIR vb.

23 (17ra) Iob xxvi° [36:8–9] *Et si uinciantur funibus paupertatis: indicabit *** opera eorum*, quia tales uident plagas suas, a *discovert* tot panniculi circa plagas etc. et Dominus uult plagas ut aer misericordie Dei possit ibi ferir. Sicut aer communis, ita misericordia; nisi precludatur, ubique se ingerit.

DESERTE s.f.

24 (12ra) Christus seruuit nobis et petit suum lucrum ut seruiamus ei penitentiam faciendo; unde qui non penitet, *⟨non⟩ retinet seruitum Christi; opus, la *deserte*, mercennarii non moretur apud te usque mane* [Lev 19:13].

25 (66va) Quarto operis locatione, gallice *deserte*: Mt. xx [Mt 20:4] *Ite et uos in uineam meam*. In fine operarii illi receperunt denarium.

DESERVIR vb.

26 (22ra) Ille solus meretur esse seruus Dei in celo qui ei seruuiuit in hoc mundo et, etiam quod plus est, qui Deo seruit, Deum desert.

27 (102rb) Nota: qui Deu sert, Deu desert, set Deo seruimus laborando et iste labor consistit in duobus, uel operando quantum ad fortes uel in patiendo quantum ad debiles et infirmos.

DESESPERANCE s.f. See A 119.

DESFAIRE vb.

28 (14vb) Sicut de corrigia et huiusmodi, et ad hoc uoluit deferre ut cariora homines haberent.

29 (23va) Illi scilicet qui deffont similitudinem Dei in anima, que est in cognitione et amore Dei et proximi.

30 (23vb) Ps. [6:9] *Discedite a me omnes qui operamini iniquitatem* seruientes de nos defferre. Si magnus horror est pendere et deffere hominem secundum corpus, quanto magis secundum animam? Facere peccatum et opus dyaboli est tordre la hart por li deffere.

31 (95rb) Nota: homo qui soutoite latrones nec de eis facit iustitiam in terra sua meretur esse desfez; latrones sunt peccata cooperta que debemus tradere a la justice in confessione.

DESGUISER vb.

32 (69rb) Quid est aliud preputium sibi facere nisi secularium mores in uestibus strictis, in capillorum recurvatione imitari, quasi erubescant quia clerici uidentur, non aduertentes illud Soph. 1 [1:8] *Visitabo super omnes, qui induiti sunt ueste peregrina, gallice desguisee . . . ?*

DESHOSER vb. See D 18.

DESIRER vb. (cf. Godefroi 2:600b). See C 78.

DESLÖER vb.

33 (28va) Vnde tantum poterat natura commendare, se prisier et loer, de eis in hoc quod neminem odiebant et tantum poterat conqueri, desloer, de eis in hoc quod neminem diligebant.

DESLOGIER vb.

34 (96vb) Nota quomodo uenit logiare, logier, inter nos et au delegier exhibuit officia caritatis.

DESMENTIR vb. See C 65; C 70.

35 (96rb) Nota quomodo fides in sacramento altaris desment oculos, gustum et intellectum, qui non potest extendere se ad probandum quod ibi sit corpus Christi.

DESMESURER vb.

36 (43rb) Ante incarnationem totus mundus erat extra mensuram idest desmesurez.

DESMONTER vb. See B 24.

37 (90rb) Tertio ciuitatem intravit equitando, tout montez, set sexta feria electus fuit de ciuitate desmontez et a pie ad suum collum crucem suam portando.

DESNATURER vb.

38 (28vb) Vnde sicut cor non debet incarnari, sic nec natura desnaturer.

DESOZ adv. (cf. TL 2:1675.26).

39 (11vb) Sic honorauit nos Dominus ponendo se *au desous* por nos mestre au desure.

40 (12ra) Descendit ergo Christus pro nobis reeuandis et posuit se *au desout* pro nobis ponendis au desore.

41 (17vb) Hinc secunda die firmamentum diuidens aquas etc. idest spirituales delicias a carnalibus et carnales posuit *au desouz*.

DESPECIER vb. (cf. Godefroi 2:624c). See A 25.

DESPISER vb.

42 (82va) Ideo in Ysa liiii [54:6] *Vt mulierem derelictam* ab adultero et a uiro *et merentem spiritu uocauit te Dominus*, idest reuocauit te ad se, o humana natura, idest quia confusa es et merens spiritu, sicut confunditur mulier adultera quando a uiro suo reuocatur, et quasi *uxorem ab adolescentia* sua idest a primis parentibus *abiecatam, despice*.

DESPLAIRE vb.

43 (13ra) Item equi de sella regis sunt tribulationes qui portant celerius nuntios Dei quo ire debent, quia tribulatio facit mundum enlaidir et *desplare*.

DESRACINER vb.

44 (34rb) *Sol obscuratus est* [Lc 23:45], arbores *desracinerent*, lapides *fendirent*, mortui surrexerunt, omnia audierunt uocem Christi, excepto corde hominis qui est endormiz par letargie peccati.

DESSEVRER vb. See C 65.

DESTEMPRANCE s.f. (cf. Godefroi 2:670c s.v. destrempance).

45 (102rb) *In ipso feruore diei* [Gen 18:1] quia ex amore est passus quod notatur per feruorem, par la *destemprance* amoris sui.

DESTORNER vb.

46 (101vb) Quando tu amas aliquem ad hoc ad quod Deus amat eum, habes uiam tuam adreciee ad Deum. Set quando amas per kanlaudiam, tu te *destornes* a uia recta.

DESTRECE s.f. (cf. Godefroi 2:699c–70a s.v. destrece). See D 48.

47 (90vb) Pedes Domini sunt misericordia et mittitas, quibus sustentamur, set caput est la *desterece* et fortitudo iudiciorum Dei.

DESTREMPER vb. See A 61.

DESTROIT s.m. (cf. TL 2:1800.48). See A 111.

48 (30va) Luc. xxf [Lc 12:50] *Baptismo habeo baptizari: et <quomodo> coartor usquedum perficiatur? . . . coartor*, je sui mis a *destroit*.

49 (34rb) Numquam fuit mater, si a *detroit* a l'enfanter, sicut Christus an detrece cordis in nos patiendo.

50 (97ra) Vnde si unum cor totum mundum haberet, se seroit il mis a *destroit*.

DESTROSSER vb.

51 (47vb) Mt. xix^o [Mt 19:23] *Amen dico uobis, quia diues difficile intrabit in regnum celorum*, quia porta angusta est et oportet destrare, idest *destrosser*, summarios idest les sommiers.

52 (102vb) Debemus etiam destrare camelos, gallice *destrosser*, idest honera peccatorum deponere per confessionem.

DESUS adv. (cf. TL 2:1810.23). See D 40, 41.

DESVELOPEMENT s.m.

53 (35vb) Rete dicitur a retinendo; de ce que tu retiens de autrui, es tu retenuz a dia-
bolo. Et quanto plus retines, plus as devvelopemenz in reti dyaboli ad te reti-
nendum. . .

DEUS s.m. See B 35.

54 (88vb) Vnde Dominus uult ut post planctum gaudeamus et iterum ad fletum reuer-
tamur ut inter lamentationes et ue interponatur carmen letitie, entre deux vers une
meure [Morawski, p. 25, no. 694; Hassell V 76].

55 (90va) Sic est: qui facit quod prohibetur in mandatis et omittit quod precipitur,
claudicat de deu heuches.

DEVISER vb.

56 (100va) Vnde sicut aliquis inuenit uiam que se divise et se fourche in tres uias, sic
puer quando nascitur inuenit uiam que diuiditur in tres, quia unus tendit ad uitam,
alius ad mortem, tertius ad umbram mortis.

DEVOIR vb. See A 102; C 25.

57 (82ra) Ysa. xiii [Is 14:1] *Prope est ut ueniat tempus eius*, pres est li tens qui doit
venir, et dies eius non elongabuntur scilicet ab eo, idest non prolongabuntur, les
jors k'il i a mis, il ne porlongera mie.

DIEU s.m. See A 24, 73, 76, 102, 127; B 29; C 70; D 27.

58 (91vb) Eccli. xiii [13:9] *Humiliare Deo et expecta manus eius*, gallice humilie toi
vers Deu et se regarde a sa main.

DIRE vb. See A 102; B 25.

DO (du?). See C 34.

DOLENT adj.

59 (83vb) *Suscipe seruum tuum in bonum* [Ps 118:122] scilicet illum ordinem angeloi-
rum, celui qui est dolenz de ses maus.

DOLOR s.f. and m. See A 54.

DONER vb.

60 (16vb) Nota de Sampsone qui permisit se tonderi ab uxore quando inclinauit caput
in gremio uxoris; hoc fit quando caro subtrahit bonas cogitationes et uiriles a corde
uirtuoso, scilicet quando cor nimis condescendit carni per compassionem uel nimis
s'a done a faire uoluntatem carnis.

61 (33rb) Vnde debet peccator dicere: "Domine, da michi gratiam tuam mutuo et ego
soluam tibi per penitentiam." Vel *absque argento* [Is 55:1], sen rien doner.

DONT adv.

62 (23vb) Dicitur: ces ovres faces tu don tu soies penduz, si quis diceret fabro: "Fac
michi cultellum ut interficiam te."

DOUX adj. See A 60.

DROIT adj.

63 (33va) Moneta ista est penitentia; facta est in gratia et de droit metal.

64 (105vb) Quartum quod attenditur in denario est pondus humilitatis: Job [28:25]
Qui fecit uentis pondus. Leuis moneta est superbia, que tollit le droit pois: Job xxii
[24:18] *Leuis est super faciem* etc.

DROIT s.m.

65 (28vb) Nota: illa pena quam patiebatur latro par *droit* et par loi por son forfait et pro culpa fuit ei pro martyrio, quia retorsit eam ad Deum per fidem et intentionem et desiderium.

66 (29rb) *Vt quid dereliquistis me? Derelinquam quippe uos* [4 Esr 1:25?], non dicit *derelinquo*, set etc., ut si li droez est soit siens et li torz soit notres.

67 (37ra) Quia si Deus faceret nobis droit, omnes dampnaremur propter peccatum primi parentis, pro quo satisfacere non poteramus. . . . Vnde per misericordiam et gratiam oportet transire illum qui ad merci uult uenire, non par droit.

68 (51bis vb) Ro. [6:19] *humanum dico* etc. Item: *sicut exhibuistis* etc.; li *humanum* sonat in minus quam droit.

DROITURE s.f.

69 (79rb) Nota quomodo uocat humilitatem illam omnem iustitiam Christus; uolebat habere toutes se(s) **droitures**; moritur sanz ses **droitures**, qui non patitur et humiliatur propter Christum.

70 (95ra) Multi sunt *qui* sciunt dicere **droiture**, set non porsivre.

DROITURIER s.m.

71 (95ra) Ps. [145:8] *Dominus diligit iustos*, gallice **droiturrers**.

DUOBLERIE s.f. (cf. Godefroi 2:757a s.v. *doublerie*).

72 (96va) Nota: duplicitas, **duoblerie**, est in intentione, ut in illis qui uolunt placere Deo et mundo, quasi seruientes duobus parrochiis, cum dicatur in euuangelio: *Nemo potest duobus dominis seruire* etc. [Mt 6:24].

DUR adj. See A 37.

73 (34ra) Et quanto plus mater laborauit en enfanter et plus morti apropinquauit, tanto plus diligit infantem suum. Nota etiam quod iacuit de **dure** jesine.

E

EFUSION s.f.

1 (102rb) *Galyleorum* [cf. Lc 13:1] idest transmigrantium, gallice trepassanz, de uno statu ad alium, idest religiosorum parmi l'efusion de sanc, idest propter nimiam teneritudinem quam habent ad corpus uel ad consanguineos.

EISSIR vb. = ISSER. See C 66.

EMBATRE vb.

2 (27va) Oues, inquam, inuente sunt in pascuis dyaboli; in hec pascua s'anbati primus homo per suam stultitiam nec poterat liberari.

3 (32ra) Multum uilipendit se qui peccat et in multis domgeriis s'embat.

EMBRASER vb.

4 (97vb) Ribaldus idest dyabolus qui electus est de proprio hospitio celi habitat et requiescit in corde espris et embrase desideris malis.

EMPÉECHIER vb.

5 (102rb) Set notandum quod *Pylatus sanguinem miscuit cum sacrificiis Galyleorum* Luc. xiiia [13:1]. Pylatus interpretatur ore contendens in contemplatione uel os malleatoris qui significat dyabolum qui empêche sacrificia, ut ire ad matutinas et huiusmodi.

EMPIRER vb.

6 (106va) Negotiatores enim quandoque adulterant idest corrumpunt et **empirent** merces suas, sicut uenditores cere miscentes cere fabas frasetas, quas molunt in molendino, et fit inde farina tenuissi(m)a.

EMPLASTRE s.m.

7 (37rb) Item modo est tempus ponendi les **emplatres** super cor contritionis et satisfactionis mediante penitentia de malis que fecimus, quia hoc tempus est partenir diete contra infirmitates que per totum annum sunt acquisite.

EMPLOIIER vb. See A 8.

EMPRÈS prep., adv. See A 60.

EMPRUNT s.m. (cf. TL 3:142.1).

8 (48ra) Nota hic quomodo quidam ornant se de alieno; sicut uetule Remenses in nuptiis accipiunt paramentum a uicinis, precaria, emprentez, ut festum peragant, set in ceco **omnia deponunt**; sic sunt amatores mundi.

ENCENDRER vb. See A 25.

ENCHERIR vb. See A 12.

ENCOMBRIER s.m. See D 19.

ENCONTRE adv. See A 68.

9 (9va) *Et obuiabit illi* etc, gallice ira a l'**encontre**, *quasi mater honorificata* a filiis suis [Eccli 15:2], gallice comme mere ennoree.

ENDETER vb.

10 (42vb) Ecclesia obligata est debit is, gallice **endetee**.

ENDITEMENT s.m.

11 (44va) Lumen uultus Dei idest similitudinis Dei li ensegnemenz et li **enditemenz** conscientie; qui auertit dorsum huic lumini, notescit ei.

ENDITER vb. (cf. Godefroi 3:131b s.v. endeter).

12 (11rb) Nota ke il a **endete** istum honorem, quia te honorauit, primo ad ymaginem suam te faciendo, licet homo, cum in honore esset, non intellexit, quia honor execat.

ENDORMIR vb. See D 44.

13 (30vb) Nota quod clamat leo in suscitatione fetus, qui quasi mortuus est et entomiz et cuius uita est quasi **endormie**, set clamore suo excitat in eo sensum et motum.

ENDROIT prep.

14 (35va) Cui [sc. Phariseo] assimilantur hodie usurarii et milites, qui se tenent cum clericis in cancellis ecclesiarum **endoroit** ante altare cum communi plebe esse contempnentes, quasi sint meliores aliis et tamen sunt peiores.

ENDURCIR vb.

15 (27va) *Hodie si uocem eius audieritis*, idest si contingat quod audiatis uerbum Dei, *nolite obdurare, endurcir, corda uestra* [Ps 94:8].

ENDURER vb. See A 30.

ENFANTER vb. See D 49.

16 (34ra) Et quanto plus mater laborauit en **enfanter** et plus morti apropinquauit, tanto plus diligit infantem suum.

ENFERGIER vb.

17 (44ra) Si asinus alicuius asinarii in luto infixus esset, gallice **enfragiez**, et asinarius

tunderet latera asini ut de luto exiret, et asinus quanto magis latera eius tunderetur, magis ac magis infigeret se in luto, nonne interficeret eum asinarius, si posset?

ENFORTER vb.

18 (34va) Set tamen extendit (sc. Christus) aliquando et **enforta** uocem suam propter multitudinem eorum quibus loquebatur uel propter affectus sui ostensionem, ut scilicet ostenderet exterius quod habebat interius.

ENGIGNEMENT s.m.

19 (30vb) Dormiens dicitur peccator in comparatione ad illusiones dyaboli idest fantomes et **engignemenz**, quia fingit sibi diuitias, delicias et honores et facit apparere aliquid esse quod nichil est.

ENLAIDIR vb. See D 43.

ENRAGIE part. (cf. TL 3:491.4 s.v. enragier).

20 (21va) Venit quasi **enragiez** et outragiez amator.

ENSEIGNE s.f. and m.

21 (59ra) *Innoua signa* [Eccli 36:6], quasi diceret, fac noveles **enseignes** scilicet paupertatis etc.

22 (59rb) Positus enim fuit in signum quadruplex inuentionis, tuitionis, directionis, recognitionis. Inuentionis, gallice en **enseigne** et de rassener.

ENSEIGNEMENT s.m. See E 11.

23 (93ra) Nota: garnisons est in castro quando doctrina et li **enseignemenz** mittitur ad cor, unde cor sufficienter garnitum est contra temptationes inimici, contra tribulationes et huiusmodi.

ENTAILLIER vb. See C 38.

ENTENDRE vb.

24 (92ra) De primo psalmista: *Expectans expectaui Dominum et intendit michi* [Ps 39:2–3]. Dicit bis *expectaui* [Ps 39:2] idest expectando perseuerauit et ipse entendit a moi.

25 (92rb) Sequitur: *et intendit michi* [Ps 39:2] in fine scilicet “Sire, **entendez** a nos,” set conqueritur Dominus in psalmo de nobis dicens: *Israel non intendit michi* [Ps 80:12].

26 (97va) Nota etiam quod sicut sol, quamcito aperitur fenestra, intrat domum, sic quamcito auris aperueris sermoni, intrabit cognitio dei. Nota del **entendre** etc.

27 (95va) Wlgariter dicitur: “**Enten** a ta main”; si carpentator percutteret ex una parte et oculum haberet ex alia, posset se ledere.

ENTOMIR vb. = ENTUMER. See E 13.

28 (106ra) Nota de corde integro et corde **enteume** et corpus sine querela, quasi diceret quod spiritus non possit conqueri de corpore.

ENTÖILLIER vb.

29 (35vb) Et quanto plus retines, plus as devvelopemenz in reti dyaboli ad te retinendum et plus i es **antoulliez**, ne possis inuenire les mailles rethis ad euadendum.

ENTRE prep. See B 35.

ENTREPRENDRE vb. (cf. TL 3:673.43). See B 18, 21; C 36.

30 (66rb) Vnde quando cor est **entrepris** temptatione dyaboli, debet dicere illud: Ps. [Is 38:14] *Domine, uim patior, responde pro me.*

ENTRER vb. See A 134.

31 (68ra) *Percipite* etc. [Mt 25:34] gallice **entrez** en saisine et prenez le fruiz.

32 (68rb) *Percipite regnum* etc. [Mt 25:34] quasi diceret, **entrez** en saisigne de hereditate quam habere debuisti a principio; parat enim erat ab origine mundi.

33 (88va) *Possidete terram quam dabo uobis in hereditatem* [Lev 20:24], terram fluentem lacte et melle, quasi diceret, **entrez** en saisine.

ENVERS prep.

34 (28ra) *Vnde: qualem uolumus Deum inuenire envers nos,* debet nos proximus inuenire, sicut Christus perdonat en soffrant.

35 (98rb) Nota illud: *nec opus nec ratio* etc. [Eccl 9:10]. Talis sibi prouidet **envers** l'iver qui nunquam uidebit hyemem et propter hoc bonum est sibi prouidere de celo, quamdui forum misericordie est.

ENVIZ adv. (cf. TL 3:725.49 s.v. a enviz).

36 (80rb) Nota: omnia negotia differri possunt excepto negotio salutis; si quis uellet tibi dare centum et diceret tibi: "Tu habebis hodie uel cras," quam inuite, gallice cum a *a(n)uit*, expectares usque ad crastinum ne forte mutaretur uoluntas dantis uel aliquid aliud infortunium accideret.

ENVOLEPER vb. = ENVELEPER.

37 (97rb) Eze. xxvii [27:24], *Negotiatores tui <multifariam in>uolucris iacincti* etc. quia les merceries dyaboli sunt **envelopes**. . . .

ERITAGE s.m. = IRITAGE. See D 16.

ESBAUBIR vb.

38 (92vb) Nota quod obsessi cum uultu hyllari se inuicem excitant et cantant, etiam quando corda eorum tremunt pour esbaubir inimicos suos ut cogantur dicere illud libri R. iii^o [1 Sam 4:8] *Ve nobis quia non fuit tanta exultatio in Israel heri et nudiustertius.*

ESBENOIANT part. See D 4.

ESCHAFAUT s.m.

39 (65rb) Hee mulieres non mouebant de domo nec ascende(bant) les eschaufanz ad predicandum, set emerant meritum apostoli quod habuerat in predicando euangelium in hoc quod in suis *** emebant fructum predicationis dando elemosinam.

ESCHANGE s.m.

40 (67ra) Sexto acquiritur per commutationem, gallice per **eschange**.

41 (82rb) Ysa. Iv [55:1] *Venite, emite abque argento et absque ulla commutatione uinum et lac,* gallice senz **eschange**.

ESCHAPER vb. See A 77; B 28.

ESCHARÇONER vb. (cf. Godefroi 3:368c s.v. eschareçonner). See A 106.

ESCHAUDER vb.

42 (26va) Extrahendum est ergo uinum cordis idest amor de uase corrupto carnis et debet homo eschauder uas suum et religare et transferre uinum in uas optimum, Deum scilicet: Ps. [76:4] *Renuit consolari anima mea.*

ESCHEVER vb.

43 (88vb) Set quidam fructus percipiunt idest illi qui hic recipiunt consolationes Dei; hereditas ista modo nos contingit affiert uel est escheve de iure.

ESCIENT s.m. See B 20.

ESCLUSE s.f.

44 (10rb) Nota: nos debemus facere escluse ori nostro por retinir doctrinam Domini.

ESCONDIT s.m.

45 (53ra) Ecce moneta supra modum etc. Ecce denariate *** non recessit ad primam pulsationem, escondit, immo plus et plus etc. Sic oportet sustinere domigeria Domini, qui uult facere negotium suum.

ESCOT s.m. See D 21.

46 (46va) Nota: qui non uenerit, ipse soluet symbolum, idest l'escoth, in inferno, quia iam parata sunt omnia.

47 (90rb) Sic Christus hodie cum honore receptus est a Iudeis, set de hoc honore facto sibi hodierno die soluit symbolum, l'escot, feria sex^{ta}.

ESCRAFE s.f.

48 (47va) Strutio relinquit oua sua et serpens sorbet ea et sic non remanet nisi concha, l'escreffe, uacua.

ESCURER vb.

49 (105ra) Et sicut mundantur uasa erea per cineres, ut patelle et poti cuprei, sic memoria mortis mundantur corda. Nota de pigra ancilla que foris uasa fricat et escure intra patellam ad duos pedes.

ESCUSER vb.

50 (28va) Nota de gradibus caritatis de quibus debemus magis nos escuser.

ESFACIER vb.

51 (105va) Secundum quod attenditur in denario est ymago, quia fides informis est tanquam materia sine forma, gallice effacie; non recipitur ad denariatas Domini et ideo oportet quod informetur ymagine equitatis. Hec est sola que facit monetam cognoscibilem.

ESFRÉISMENt s.m.

52 (10ra) Ante istam grandinem precedit li esparz effrement et terror.

ESLÉECIER vb. See A 7.

ESMOVEMENT s.m.

53 (93va) Seruitus dura est in peccato, concussio in temptatione seu periculo, gallice esmovemenz, labor in pena.

ESPANDRE vb. See A 82.

54 (13rb) Noli repellere idest espandre scutellam Domini tui, immo comedere pro sanitate et et in hoc non uilificatum estima, set potius honoratum.

ESPARGNIER vb. See A 37; B 13.

ESPART s.m.

55 (10ra) Sequitur: *ante grandinem pre^{ce}ssit coruscatio* [Eccli 32:14] esparz. . . . Ante istam grandinem precedit li esparz effrement et terror.

ESPEE s.f.

56 (36ra) Porreta: Percutit nos Dominus in presenti de plat de l'espee, set in futuro de tranchant. Ensis est sententia Domini.

ESPRIS part. (cf. TL 3:1250 s.v. esprendre). See E 4.

ESPROVE s.f.

57 (84va) *Tempus d'esprueve est uita presens.*58 (84vb) *Iob vii^o [7:1] Temptatio est uita hominis, gallice d'esprove.*

ESSAI s.m. See B 37.

59 (33vb) *Nota de taberna Domini quomodo dedit nobis uinum sui sanguinis pour essai in circumcisione.*

ESSAIIER vb.

60 (49ra) *Sunt qui nolunt comedere uel transglutire per consensem, set tamen gustare, essaier, per delectationem.*

ESSIL s.m.

61 (7va) *Nota primo Tho. x [Tob 10:4] Heu me! fili mi, ut quid te misimus peregrinari.* Hec sunt uerba anime consortio Christi desolate; *peregrinari*, quia en essil quasi eum [enim MS] exulat Deus, cum a corde repellitur.

ESSILLIER vb.

62 (100ra) *Vel aliter habitus exterior est conuersatio humilis; hunc habitum accipit Dominus; in sua natuitate non habu*(i)*t.* Vnde in euangelio, quia ita erant essilie et use quod nomen suum amiserant ut uirides uel flaui uocarentur.

ESTOC s.m.

63 (64vb) *Sapientia uero liberat et securum facit possessorem suum. Primi quia sunt coeui stipiti suo, gallice etoc, quia quamcito infunditur, statim fructificat.*

ESTOPER vb.

64 (24ra) *Ps. [9:28] Cuius os maledictione, idest mesdire, amaritudine contentionis et conuicci et dolo idest deceptione plenum est, est estopee.*

ESTOUT adj. See C 18.

ESTRANGE adj. See A 23.

65 (60vb) *Puncture baculorum ipsorum peregrinorum fuerunt puncture clauorum et lancee alienorum, idest Iudeorum qui fuerunt Christo estrange, quia estrange dicuntur vulgariter crudeles, in quibus non inuenitur dulcedo aliqua aut bonitas: Je l'a, fait en, trove estrange.*66 (99ra) *Dii alieni demones idest crudeles sunt, sicut solet dici crudelis homo, in quo non inuenitur dulcedo aliqua uel bonitas: je l'ai, fait on, trove si estrange.*

ESTRANGIER vb.

67 (26ra) *Non portat pedes, set pedes eum qui sequitur appetitum ad peregrinandum, por estranzgier a Deo, perdere solacia sua et familiaritatem.*

ESTRE vb. See A 11, 13, 102, 124; B 25; C 63; D 8, 66.

68 (23vb) *Facere peccatum et opus dyaboli est tordre la hart por li deffere. Dicitur: Ces ovres faces tu don tu soies penduz; si quis diceret fabro: "Fac michi cultellum ut interficiam te."*

ESTRILLE s.f.

69 (20vb) *Nitescit equus quando est bene estrillez; sic caro cum fricata est tribulacione. Nota de dentibus de l'estrille.*

ESTRILLIER vb. See E 68.

ESVILLIER vb. (cf. Godefroi 3:668c).

70 (50ra) Timor est uigil uigilantissimus idest gaite evillie et tempore pacis et tempore belli, ipsam pacem et securitatem suspectam habens ianitor cordis cum claua etc. EUNER vb. (cf. Godefroi 1:499c s.v. auner).

71 (46va) Homo, quamdiu uiuit, non cessat ire, set in morte tunc tunc uadit secundum quod communiter dicitur de homine moriente, il s'euna.

EVROX s.f.

72 (21ra) Numquam habuit aliquis equus tant vilenes evrox quantus equus iste.

F

FAILLANCE s.f. See B 21.

FAILLE s.f.

1 (82ra) Abuc ii^o [Hab 2:3] *Veniens ueniet*: geminatio certificatio est; il venra sanz faille, et non tardabit.

FAIM s.m. and f.

2 (81rb) Vbi non habetur iste panis, en i muert de fain.

FAIRE vb. See A 30, 72; B 17, 18, 20, 21; D 60; E 65, 66, 68.

3 (8vb) Nota: quando despicitur opus aliquod, en fait honte a l'ovrier.

4 (18rb) Et omnes sumus de haine et mortal faite.

5 (18vb) Offer ergo peius uadium hospitii tui par pais faisant.

6 (43rb) Adam imposuit censem terre proprie idest corpori comedere propter necessitatem, uestiri propter frigus, set nos illum censem augmentamus, quia de die in diem excedimus, gallice fesons outrage in cibo, potu, et uestitu, set superfluitates talium non sunt circa hanc terram benefacientes, que bene colenda est per penitentiam ut fructus reddat bonos multiplices.

7 (63rb) Secundum vulgare dicitur: Vos ne festes se oiseuses; non et occupati sunt in nichilo faciendo.

8 (82rb) Mititas enim nescit irasci uel odire hominem uel ledere; il ne sauroit faire felonie.

9 (99ra) Vnde sicut filius patrisfamili(a)s ribaldus electus ab hospitio patris similat patri suo, gallice fait samblant alicuius auantagii, ut se corrigendi et huiusmodi et sic in fine portat pallium matris sue uel capam patris uel alius ad tabernam, sic dyabolus aliquod delectabile preponit cordi et mediante illo spoliat animam a ueste caritatis et reddit eam sibi subiectam.

FAIS s.m. See C 47.

FAIT s.m. See B 28.

FAMILIARITÉ s.f. See A 23.

FANTOSME s.m. See E 19.

FAUSSETÉ s.f. See D 1.

FAUTRE s.m. See A 41.

FELONIE s.f. See F 8.

FEMBRER vb. See A 106.

FENDRE vb. See D 44.

FERIR vb. See C 56; D 23.

FERMANT s.m. = FERMANCE? s.f. (cf. Godefroi 3:759a).

10 (64rb) Et nota de libro conscientie in quo legere debemus. Et nota septem impedimenta que nos impediuit ne legamus in libro conscientie, que significata sunt per illa sigilla, gallice *fermanz*, Apo. vi [5:1], quibus signatus est liber.

FEVE s.f. See C 75.

FIEVER vb. (cf. TL 3:1833.10 fievé).

11 (13va) Nota quantum est quod Dominus uocauit te ad suum consilium, sicut uocantur sapientes; hec est sapientia Dei relinquere omnia et tales sunt feve de honore.

FIN s.m. See A 57.

12 (82ra) Ideo in uerbis premissis *Ego cogito* etc. bene sequitur *ut dem uobis finem et patientiam* [Jer 29:11], ke je mete fins a uos mesfez et a uos tribulacions, hec cogito.

13 (94rb) Vnde si diligo aliquem propter diuitias, pulcritudinem et huiusmodi, non est finalis amor, quia huiusmodi non ualent fins idest morti.

FIN adj. See A 59, 64, 65.

14 (94rb) Do hoc amore *fine*; Io xv [15:9] *Sicut dilexit me Pater, et ego dilexi uos* scilicet ad tormenta in hoc mundo toleranda.

15 (94va) Amor de tens est inter malos, qui non durat nisi parum. Et ideo non est *fine*, quia tantum durat quantum benefactum.

FINEMENT adv.

16 (102va) Ecce feruor, quia propter eos uoluit *finement* morir.

FINER vb. See A 5.

17 (94vb) Septimo *in finem dilexit eos* idest usque ad hoc quod uoluit finare, gallice *finer*, pro nostro escoto, sicut cum iuuat amicum suum ad finandum in taberna.

18 (102va) Non enim posses *finer* de sola gutta, nisi Deus afferret.

FLAJOL s.m. See B 24.

FOIRE s.f. See A 130.

FOL s.m. See D 22.

FORCE s.f.

19 (20rb) *Iustus est saluator* [Zach 9:9] quasi diceret, saluabit te per iustitiam, non potentiam, ut discat per ius, non par *force*, uincere.

20 (24ra) Sicut saluat nobilis hospitem suum de *force* ueritatis cordis, in fide hec diuinatur tripliciter, diminutione, augmentatione, et mala uita oris in locutione.

21 (30vb) Ad horum similitudinem legitur Dominus in euangeliu ter clamas de grant *force*.

22 (67va) Non possumus in ludo Domini iactare minus quam duodeuiginti puncta; unde non possumus nisi lucrari. Dominus enim, qui scit totum posse et la *force* ludi, docet nos quomodo possumus lucrari.

FORCHIER adj. See D 56.

FORFAIT s.m. See D 65.

FORGIE s.f.

23 (105rb) Venit ergo filius tanquam monetarius, gallice monoiers, ad reformatum monetam istam en la *forgie* huius mundi.

FORJUGIER vb. See A 46.

24 (12va) Exemplum de magnis dominis qui sunt deducti per multas quadragenias et multa consilia accipiuntur, antequam sint forjuge de feodis suis.

25 (13vb) Nota: citati sumus per bannum ut nouo regi uenienti occurramus et releuemus feoda nostra ab eo. Alioquin digni erimus eis spoliari, gallice **forjugier**, scilicet animam et corpus.

26 (32va) Prius homo dimitteret se exulare et priuari rebus suis et huiusmodi quam permitteret se diminui de honore suo siue **forjugier**.

FORJURER vb. See D 16.

27 (24rb) Ps. [101:9] *Qui laudabant me* idest qui debebant laudare me pro beneficiis meis uel debebant se laudare de me *aduersum me iurabant* idest il me **forjuroient**.

FORLIGNIER vb.

28 (27vb) Nota: sicut est uitium filio naturali si dissimilis sit patri in moribus bonis, ut si pater fuit patiens et misericors et huiusmodi et filius eius sit impatiens et crudelis, uitium ipsius est et dicitur **forligneze**.

FORME s.f. See A 59.

FORNIER s.m.

29 (97vb) Nota: Dominus non est ribaldus qui in furno habitat. Osee vii [7:4] *Omnes adulterantes, quasi clibanus incensus a coquente*, gallice fornier.

FORS adv. See C 20, 66.

30 (92va) Sequitur: *Et de luto fecis* [Ps 39:3], quasi diceret, ipse me extraxit fors de mes lies.

FORSPÄISIER vb.

31 (25vb) Ysa. [55:6] *Querite Dominum, dum inueniri potest*, dum non est adhuc **forpaisiez**. Queritur aliquando ubi non est; sicut ille qui uaccam quesuit in dolio, sic qui in diuitiis, deliciis, et honoribus.

FORSENEEMENT adv.

32 (71vb) Sic peccator secum suum defert tormentum in conscientia sua ii Cor. v *insensate*, idest **forseneement**, *uixerunt pro hiis que **** idest peccatis *summa dedisti tormenta* [Sap 12:23].

FORT adj. See A 42.

FRANC adj. See D 7.

FRANCHIR vb.

33 (24ra) Iob [17:3] *Libera me, Domine, franchis moi*.

FRANCHISE s.f.

34 (32rb) Nota: magna uilitas est de libertate filiorum Dei redigere se in seruitium peccati, demonum et sollicitudinum, de sponsa regis uenire en soignentage dyaboli, de **franchise** au servage, de filio regis ad seruitium serui, qui plus lassatur in uiliori officio sine mercede etc. ad fremitum.

FREMIR vb. See A 75; C 66.

FRERE s.m.

35 (60ra) Beniamin frater minor in cuius sacco inuentus est cyphus Ioseph; per Ioseph Christus, per Beniamin fratrem minimum beatus Franciscus, li freres menors, per cyphum tribulatio.

FRESCHE adj.

36 (92vb). Nota quomodo obsessi non curant nisi quod muri castri sui sint fortes et

quod bene sint ipsi garniti. Non habent cotidie fresches carnes nec exeunt nisi cum periculo.

FROTER vb.

37 (99vb) Nota: ubi sufficit li rinciers, non oportet multum fricare, **froter**.

FRUIT s.m. See E 31.

FUER s.m.

38 (33rb) Nota de fuer denariatarum suarum: *Emite, inquit et tamen sine argento* [Is 55:1], quod tamen non uidetur, quia multam penitentiam exigit, set etiam penitentia cedit nobis ad uoluntatem.

39 (81vb) Tertio in nostra glorificatione quando reuendidit denariatas suas ad tale pretium, fuer, quale receperat a patre: Luc. [22:29] *Dispono uobis sicut dispositus michi Pater meus regnum.*

40 (89ra) Nota: a principio Adam priuauit posteros suos hereditate tanquam reus lese maiestatis, set Christus uenit ut reponeret nos in hereditate nostra a fer et a le sen.

G

GĀAIGNĒOR s.m. See B 23.

GAITE s.m. and f. See E 70.

GAITIER vb. See C 28.

GAP s.m.

1 (66vb) Preterea in principio uidetur hoc uideri a gas, set quando nos intramus possessionem, tunc uidetur denariate.

GARDE s.f. See A 42.

2 (63va) Et loquitur ibi psalmista de otiosis iuxta illud: *pacem peccatorum uidens* [Ps 72:3]; et prosequere sic: il ne se prennent garde quod debeant mori.

3 (80rb) Ille sequitur stellam preuiam qui se prestat garde a ceus qui benefaciunt et proficiunt nec deficiunt, sicut stella que uocatur Abscintium idest dyabolus que stella errauit. Et ita qui sequuntur eam, errant.

GARNIR vb. See D 20.

4 (98rb) Rebecca patientia mouet Deum ad locum spatiouum, plentiif, et **garni**, quia quicquid cadit in manu patientie, totum uertitur in munitionem.

GARNISON s.f. See E 23.

GASTINE s.f.

5 (70rb) *Et uiderunt sanctificationem desertam* [1 Mach 4:38] idest affectum sine Deo. Nota quanta **gastine** est in corde a quo Deus recessit: Iohel [2:3] *Post eum solitudo deserti.*

GAUCHE adj.

6 (52va) Nota de uia profunda et stricta; quando occurrit inimicus tuus, tu non potes ne tranche ne **gauche**.

GENESTE s.m. and f.

7 (60vb) Et hoc per crucem, sicut per cruces poni solent in uiis ad dirigendum et **geneste** nodate.

GENS s.f. ? = GIENS s.m. (= genu)?

8 (27rb) *Cumque regio fulgeret habitu, idest exemplo bono et inuocasset omnium rectorem et saluatorem Deum per humilitatem orationis, assumpsit duas famulas et super unam scilicet spem innitebatur etc, ne caderet in desperationem, altera idest humilitas sequebatur dominam, defluentia <in> humum indumenta sustentans* [Esth 15:5-7], ueritatem scilicet, ne faceret pulueres a la gens, . . .

GENT s.f.

9 (59vb) Set turbabuntur qui habitant terminos a signis suis, *genz de marche*.

10 (104vb) *Ne auertatur humilis factus confusus* [Ps 73:21], quasi diceret, non facias petite gent honte.

GENTIL adj.

11 (107ra) Sunt etiam sicut regretarii qui uendunt affectia, caseos et huiusmodi ad fenestras et minus emunt ut plus uendant. Tales non sunt nobiles, *gentil*, mercatores.

GENTILLECE s.f.

12 (8rb) i^o R. ii^o [1 Sam 2:30] *Quicumque honorificauerit me, glorificabo eum; qui autem contempnunt me, erunt ignobiles*, quia perdent lor gentillece quam habent a fide.

13 (97va) Et secundum quod plus querit huiusmodi, tanto ampliorem locum facit dyabolo; humiliate ergo Deo uos, ei reddendo quicquid ab eo procedit, ut gentillece et huiusmodi, ut non uelitis retinere uobis, set uti huiusmodi in seruicio Dei.

GERBE s.f. (cf. Godefroi 4:265a s.v. gerbee).

14 (100ra) Nota quod area uocatur quicquid habet quis pati mali in hac uita quasi les jarbes en tas, set boni sunt quasi les gerbes sub flagello.

GITER vb. = JETER. See C 20.

GLACIER vb. See A 86.

GLOREFIER vb. See A 61.

GLOTON s.m.

15 (27ra) Nota quomodo li glotons gustato bono uino appropinquat dolio, quia sapit melius ante dolium et quomodo uix exit nisi expulsus et quomodo spoliat se.

16 (104vb) Ideo tales dicuntur glutones, *gloton*, a glutiendo.

GOTIERE s.f.

17 (88ra) Non iacet homo libenter in stillicidio, en *gotiere*.

GRAISLE adj. and s. See B 28.

GRANDOR s.f.

18 (102ra) *Emitte etc. de sede magnitudinis* [magnitudine? MS] [Sap 9:10] idest solue la grandeur tue sedis idest humilitatis tue.

GRANT adj. See A 85; C 66; F 21.

19 (34rb) Dicitur enim de nobilibus: iste habet sanguinem et latronem in uilla ista idest iustitiam sanguinis, set sanguis Christi melius de tant qui com il vos est plus granz metiers de misericordia quam de uindicta.

20 (41vb) Wlgariter dicitur: Nimia fertilitas idest plantez trop granz saporem non habet [Morawski, p. 60, no. 1644; Hassell P 195; Di Stefano, p. 695].

GRIEF adj. See A 17.

GROS adj. See B 28.

GUERREDONER vb.

21 (92vb) Iudic. xiii [15:5] Vxor Sampsonis accepit uirum alium propter quod ipse combussit segetes Philistinorum; sic Christus multas animas remaritatas et reformatas in iudicio inueniet, set anima sancta que non maritat se et suum maritum exspectat fideliter erit guerredonee a Domino.

H

HAIE s.f.

1 (46rb) Et *Exi in uias* idest in cecos et claudos qui habent cyphum uel scutellam ad transeuntes *et sepes* [Lc 14:23] idest ad illos qui sedent iuxta rubos gallice **haies** ad consuendum ueteres panniculos.

HAINE s.f. See F 4.

HALE s.f. See D 3.

HANTISE s.f.

2 (17va) Nota de senibus qui frequentabant domum Iohachym. Bona mulier erat, set tamen **la hantise** male etc.

HART s.f. See D 30.

3 (93vb) Ysa lviii [57:6] *In partibus torrendis pars tua*, unde mali non habebunt ibi partem, set **la hart**.

HASTER vb. See C 32.

4 (100vb) Set notandum quod si aliquis in affligendo corpus suum habet intentionem accelerandi, de **haster**, mortem suam, homicida est mortis sui ipsius.

HASTIF adj. See A 63.

5 (16rb) Nota quod dicit Iacobus [5:7] *fructum temporaneum et serotinum*; fructus temporaneus, gallice **hatif**, in consolatione spirituali, serotinus, gallice tardif, in uita eterna.

HERBERGIER vb.

6 (24ra) *In omni seductione iniquitatis*, quia obseruat son cep et eis qui melius seruiunt, peius soluit *hiis qui pereunt*; *eo quod* *⟨caritatem⟩ ueritatis non receperunt no⟨n⟩ vodrent herbergier*, *ut salui fierent* [2 Thess 2:10].

7 (36rb) Set multa sunt corda mal **herbergie**, quia hospites sunt dyaboli per peccatum.

8 (97ra) Nota: mundus est por **herbergier** corpora, celum propter corda, quia totus mundus non aptus est por **herbergier** unum solum cor, sicut nec stabulum regem.

HEUCE s.f. (cf. TL 4:1090.48). See D 55.

HONTE s.f. and m. See F 3; G 10.

9 (13vb) Istos honores non cognoscunt mali, immo uidetur eis de **honte** quod sit honor [cf. Morawski, p. 73, no. 2018].

10 (78va) Ideo dicitur [1 Sam 2:30] *Quicumque honorificauerit me, glorificabo eum; qui autem contempserint me, erunt ignobiles*, idest livre a **hunte**.

HONTOIIER vb.

11 (32rb) Sic peccator, qui est inebriatus amore peccati, non curat de sua uilitate, set illum qui se **hontoie** cooperit Dominus: Eze. vi [16:8] *Expandi amictum meum super te*.

HORDEMENT s.m. (cf. Godefroi 4:510c s.v. hourdement).

12 (79va) Nota quomodo patientia est quasi li hordemenz omnium uirtutum, unde ultimo inter uirtutes ponitur.

HUMILIER vb. = UMILIER. See D 58.

I

IREE s.f.

1 (56va) Item sicut Iacob fuit simplex et domi manens oblatione duorum hedorum obtinuit ab Ysaac patre suo benedictionem de iree celi etc., sic beata uirgo uotum duplicitis uirginitatis.

IVER s.m. See E 35.

J

JALOS adj.

1 (25rb) Nota quomodo *opertus est* *⟨quasi⟩ pallio zeli* [Is 59:17] sicut zelotypus, gallice **jalous**.

2 (101va) *Indutus est enim pallio zeli* Ysa. [59:17] exemplo zelotypi, de **jalous**, qui mutat uestem suam recessu simulato ut inuestiget facta amasie sue.

JALOSIE s.f. See A 85.

JARBE s.f. See G 14.

3 (49rb) Nota quomodo iarbe, les jarbes, iacebant per campos.

JESINE s.f. See D 73.

JOR s.m. See C 21; D 57.

4 (98va) Porrecta: Mensuremus modo uitam hominis sexaginta annos; homo bene dormit medietatem uite, ke par nuit ke par **JOR** hec mors occupauit et in hoc habet pauper a Deo bene parti sicut diues, preterea xv annos antequam cognoscat delicias et honore, set sciat uti et reliquum tempus habent tribulationes ita saisi ad magnam partem, quod melius esset mors quam uiuere.

JORNEE s.f. See C 32.

JUGIER vb.

5 (14ra) Et post sequitur: *et iudicium pacis iudicate* [Zach 8:16] idest **jugiez pais**, non guerram, ut aperte peccantibus, non proditionem.

JUSTICE s.f. See D 31.

L

LADRE s.m. See C 66.

LAIDENGIER vb.

1 (88ra) Mulier litigiosa est conscientia que semper litigat et remurmurat contra peccatorem, sicut facit mulier quando maritus eius reddit de taberna et increpat eum, gallice **laidanger**.

LAISSIER vb. See C 36.

2 (67ra) Hoc facto dictum est Abrahe: *Respice celum, et numera stellas, si potes* [Gen 15:5], quasi diceret, tu qui as laissie ton linage et ta terre, *respice celum et numera stellas, si potes*, quasi diceret, non posses.

LANGUE s.f. See A 22.

LARGE adj. See B 31.

LARGE s.m. (cf. TL 5:176.1).

3 (52va) Sic etc. Tren. [Lam 3:1] *Inimici eius apprehenderunt eam*; ideo au large misericordie Dei est exeundum.

LASCHECE s.f.

4 (93vb) Ysa. xxxiii^o [33:20] *Respice Syon sollempnitatis nostre ciuitatem; oculi tui uidebunt Iherusalem ciuitatem opulentam; non auferentur clavi eius in sempiternum* idest sententie quibus mali dampnati sunt firme erunt et faciet ad decorum aliorum electorum *et funiculi* scilicet dilectionis mutue *non rumpentur*; hic de facili rumpuntur li lascest.

LASCHETÉ s.f. See B 21.

LECON s.f. See F 40 (le sen)?

LETARGIE s.f. See D 44.

LEVER vb.

5 (9rb) Quarto per iustitiam quantum ad lever emendas in terra sua pro forefactis, sicut honor est principi quando habet bonum iustitiarium sub se.

LIE s.f. See B 27; F 30.

6 (26va) Iere. xlvi^ob [48:11] *Et requieuit Moab in fecibus suis, gallice sor lie, et non trans fusus, raagiez, de uase in uas.*

7 (92rb) Nota de illis qui extrahi nolunt filo tenui gallice de lie.

LIGNAGE s.m. See L 2.

8 (24ra) *Dominus prope est* [Ps 144:18] multipliciter consanguinitate, de nostre lignage, in incarnatione.

LIMER vb.

9 (98rb) Et quanto plus manet in immunditia, tanto grauior ad lauandum et durior. Item oportet multum limer et fucare sabulo et cynere.

LIVRER vb. See C 32; H 10.

10 (30ra) *Vel consummatum est* [Jo 19:30], quasi diceret, modo homo totum tres *** idest modo homo membra omnia a a passion livr^{xx}.

11 (49va) Ipse enim per Ysa. [43:24] *Servire me fecistis* etc. et *laborem michi pre- buistis*, gallice livrastes.

12 (99ra) Nota quomodo Deus auditur in predicatore; os enim Dei est; audio Deum, quando je livre aures ad audiendum uerbum Dei.

LÖER vb. See D 33.

LOGIER vb. See D 34.

LOI s.f. See D 65.

LONGEMENT s.m. See A 72.

LOSENGER vb.

13 (22ra) *Pater Abraham, miserere mei* [Lc 16:24], dixit diues epulo. Illum uocabat patrem en losengent, cuius numquam uoluit esse filius et Dominus numquam uoluit laudare Iohannem, nisi quando recesserant discipuli eius.

M

MÄAILLE s.f. See B 13.

MATIN s.m.

1 (88rb) Nota: sicut coquus expellit molosum le **maatin** de coquina per aquam calidam, sic dyabolus per aquam calidam lacrimarum.

MARCHÉANDER vb.

2 (52ra) Ibi bonum est **machander**, ubi uilis est moneta et magna mensura.

MADRE s.m.

3 (87va) Nota quod modo est tempus religandi cyphos de murra, gallice de **madre**, et Deus clamat quod paratus est religare cyphos nostros fractos per peccatum.

MAILLE s.f. See E 29.

MAIN s.f. See A 44, 118; D 58; E 27.

MAINTENIR vb.

4 (21ra) Et ne timeas quod non possit retenir la **pais** siue **maintenir**.

5 (91vb) *Expecta Dominum, uiriliter age: et confortetur cor tuum et sustine Deum* [Ps 26:14], quasi diceret, **maintien** toi comme vigureus etc.

MAINTIEN s.m. See B 5.

MAISTRE adj. and s.m.

6 (100rb) Tu non tenes Dominum a **mestre**, ex quo non uis ire ad scolas suas idest ad sermonem.

MAL adj. and s. See A 79, 81; B 18, 20; D 59 (s.; cf. TL 5:947.11); H 2, 7.

7 (26ra) *Et abiit uagus in uia cordis sui* [Is 57:17] per desideria diuersa et peccata; qui in Deo non inuenit solacium, ailles **males** voies.

8 (37vb) Nota: pauperes hic accusantur, excoriantur et sunt **mal** mene, set gaudendum est eis, quia istis modis retrahuntur uia inferni et propter huiusmodi penas timent alias perpetrare, set diuites non reprehenduntur.

MALADIE s.f. See A 54.

MANIERE s.f. See A 59.

MANIEMENT s.m.

9 (20rb) Dyabolus contra dicebat hominem non esse suum, quia emerat eum et se uendiderat et in possessionem eius prescripserat, gallice teneure, et longum **maniement**.

MARCHE s.f.

10 (23ra) Io. xvi^o [16:33] *In mundo pressuras* etc., quia modicum ad quod multi tendunt et quia en **marche** in strictis currus obuiant.

11 (59va) Set turbabuntur qui habitant terminos a signis tuis, genz de **marche** [cf. Wilmart, "Gérard de Liège," 372 n. 58; 374 n. 62].

12 (60rb) Ideo petit Psalmista: *Fac mecum signum in bono* etc. [Ps 85:17]. Nota hic quanti principes solent munire terminos terre, gallice **les marches**.

MARIER vb.

13 (82rb) Tertio quandoque per matrimonium maxime, par miez **marier**.

14 (82vb) Tertio uenitur ad pacem propter matrimonium, quod factum est in incarnatione filii Dei, sicut solet fieri apud seculares et frequentius por miez **marier**, quando scilicet ille qui re(g)ius est uel aliquis de parte eius contrahit cum minus nobili.

MARRI adj.

15 (64vb) Nota de clericis, prestre **marrin**, qui in libris propriis nesciunt legere et in alienis legere uolunt aliorum conscientias temere iudicando.

MARRIR vb.

16 (23rb) Nota: ille qui uidet finem uie sue non potest marrir; sicut qui uidet ***, sic qui dirigit ad Deum intentionem.

MAS adj.

17 (102va) Deus uoluit partir **max** ut essemus participes bonorum suorum.

MĒISME adj. See A 96.

MENER vb. See M 8.

MENOR adj. See F 35.

MERCERIE s.f. See E 37.

MERCI s.f. See A 131; B 29; C 67, 77; D 67.

18 (34va) Dominus, qui sententiam posset ferre contra nos, se offert ad ius ut nos ad iniuriam nostram recognoscamus et nos ponamus en sa **merci**.

19 (36rb) Set quando dantur alicui prospera unde rideat, signum est quod non est receptus a **merci**.

MERE s.f. See E 9.

MESCHIEF s.m.

20 (36rb) Et sicut puer quando leditur currit ad matrem (et cui conqueri nisi matri?), sic nos de touz nos **meschies** debe(m)us currere ad Deum qui solus nouit, uult et potest consilium adhibere.

MESDIRE vb. See E 64.

MESFAIRE vb. See A 56; C 25.

21 (82ra) Vnde ad matutinas in illa dominica inuitatorium: *Surgite, uigilate* etc., set possent dicere illi qui sunt **mesfait**: “Non est nobis gaudendum de aduentu regis, immo magis dolendum. Nescimus enim quid cogitat de nobis; forsitan cogitat nos perdere et nomen nostrum delere.”

MESFAIT s.m. See C 25; F 12.

MESOFRIR vb.

22 (16va) Mos est dyaboli statim peccatori eruere oculos, postquam ceperit peccatorem, quia si relinquerentur ei oculi, non ita de facili duceretur per quoslibet malos passus. Per malos passus ducit eum, quia cui male accidit, en li **mesoffre** [Hassell M 103; TL 5:1658. 33–34].

MESPASSER vb.

23 (52ra) Mouetur pes quando affectus hominis **mespasse** amando mundum et ea que in mundo sunt. Iohannes apostolus nolebat que nos **mespassesoins** cum dixit: *Nolite diligere mundum* etc. [I Jo 2:15].

MESTIER s.m. See A 115; G 19.

24 (63rb) Nota de hoc quod dicit apostolus [2 Tim 4:5]: *Opus fac euangeliste*. Quomodo? Qui uult addi(s)cere aliquod artificium, gallice **meteier**, iungit se circa peritos illius artis. Nam sicut uolens addiscere artem carpentariam in domo fabri ferrarii stultus reputaretur, sic nos ad exempla sanctorum debemus operari contra illos qui ad exempla malorum operantur.

25 (86rb) *Exiit qui seminat seminare semen suum* [Lc 8:5], in hiis uerbis exprimitur de quali officio, gallice **mestier**, Christus uenit seruire in terra.

MESURABLE adj.

26 (19rb) *Modestia uestra nota sit* etc. [Phil 4:5] hoc ad primum *nota sit* idest uolo quod uos sitis **mesurable**, non sicut illi qui gloriantur quando multum dat ad comedendum.

MESURE s.f. See A 37.

METAL s.m. See D 63.

METRE vb. See A 24, 74, 123; D 39, 48, 50, 57; F 12.

27 (28rb) *Sequitur: et despice ignorantiam proximi* [Eccli 28:9], quasi diceret, met en nunchaloir illud quod fit tibi per le vonsen proximi tui.

28 (100vb) *Vel qui in iustitia meditabitur* [Eccli 14:22] idest qui ponet omnem meditationem suam ut faciet iustitiam scilicet illam qua *neglit*, meste en nunchaloir, *dampnum* suum *propter amicum*, Christum scilicet: Prou. xiig [12:26], qui uerus amicus nichil erga nos retinuit ut nos poneret en saisine.

MEURE s.f. See D 54.

MIEUS adv.and adj. See M 13, 14.

MISERICORDE s.f.

29 (37ra) Prou. xxviii [28:13] *Qui abscondit scelera sua non dirigetur*, et qui cooperit peccata sua, ja a **misericordie** ne parvenra siue non tenebit uiam rectam salutis.

30 (95vb) *Bonus misericors omnibus qui indigent sue misericordie officium communicat*; de toto mundo et de purgatorio facit sibi agrum ad seminandum semen misericordie ut metat uitam eternam; proprium territorium sanctis **misericordie** est multiplicationum miseria.

MOINS adj.

31 (95vb) *Apo. iii [3:9-10] Ego dilexi te quando seruasti uerbum patientie mee* idest mandatum meum; de seruanda patientia quam dico meam, quia ego docui uerbo, ostendi exemplo. *Vel mee nostram patientiam uocat Christus suam*, quia iuuat nos et portat le plus et nos le **moies**.

MOISTE adj.

32 (97rb) *Iob xl [40:16] Sub umbra enim dormit in secreto calami* *<et>* *in locis humentibus*. . . . *Vel aliter in umbra dormit*,, quia ita turpis est dyabolus, si uideretur, relinqueretur *in locis humentibus*, gallice **moistes**.

MOLLE s.m.

33 (94vb) *In hoc uerbo septem modis exposito datur nobis modus seu forma caritatis fraterne*, sicut funditur campana in modulo suo, gallice **mole**.

MONJOIE s.f.

34 (23va) *In hac autem dominica, que propinqua est diei natalis, quasi ad montem gaudii*, gallice **la montjoie**, peregrinationis sue peruenit. *Vnde exultat more peregrinorum dicentium: montjoie, deus, montjoie!* [cf. Bériou, *La prédication de Ranulphe* 2:17.199–201 (Sermo 1.3)].

MONMIRAIL s.

35 (87rb) *Nota quod in principio dicebatur Iudas Machabeus, set propter probitates*

suas postea tantum dictus est Machabeus idest protectio, sicut de illo de **Monmirail** qui dicebatur cil de **Montmirail**.

MONOIER s.m. See F 23.

MONTER vb. See D 37.

MORIR vb. See A 80, 129; F 2, 16.

MORTEL adj. See F 4.

MORT s.f. See A 129.

36 (37va) A tart quiert la viee, qui a la **mort** le quiert [cf. Morawski, p. 6, no. 154].

37 (102rb) Abraham in hostio tabernaculi est Christus in egressu mortis, gallice sor le point de sa **mort**.

MUETE s.f.

38 (80ra) *Vidimus stellam eius in Oriente* etc. [Mt 2:2]. Nota circa apparitionem factam regibus notabilia multa. . . . Hec sunt quatuor notabilia circa la **muete** istorum regum.

N

NAVRER vb. See A 133.

NONCHALOIR vb. See M 27, 28.

1 (95ra) Prou. xii [12:26] *Qui negligit dampnum propter amicum, iustus est; dampnum scilicet rerum, amicorum, corporis et honoris.* Nota quomodo ista fuerunt in Christo. . . . Vnde posuit Christus *(in)* incuria, gallice en **nunchaloir**, ista quatuor, dummodo posset nos retinere.

2 (104va) Ideo Eccli. xxviii^o [28:9–10] *Memorare testamentum Altissimi et despice ignominiam proximi,* idest pon*(i)*tis en **nunchaloir** acsi per ignorantiam fecisset, et *abstine te a lite.*

NOVEL adj. See C 25; E 21.

NUIRE, NOISIR vb. See C 25.

3 (35va) Prou. xvii [17:11] *Semper iurgia querit malus* idest non querit, se **noise** non, et *angelus crudelis* etc.

NUISOS adj.

4 (49vb) Cor peccatoris taberna est; furni, molendina loca sunt **noiseus**.

5 (97vb) Locus **noiseux** est cor peccatoris temptatum quod loquitur illi quem amat; sic dices, sic facies ei etc.

NUIT s.f. See J 4.

O

OBLIANCE s.f.

1 (80rb) Nota quomodo benefacta temporalia Dei sunt quasi munuscula amantis pur sovenance, set illud quod Deus dat por sovenance nos uertimus en **obliance**.

ONI adj.

2 (98ra) Ysa. xiii [14:23] *Scopabo eam in scopa terens* [terrens MS]. Nota quomodo scopa uerberando mundat et mundando uerberat. Sic etc; nota et quod citius purgat, gallice ramonue, domum **onnie** et plaigne quam ubi sunt anguli, quia ubi angulus, ibi sordes.

ONORER vb. See E 9.

ORLE s.m. and f.

3 (13ra) Nota de illis qui inde tantummodo faciunt fymbriam, **orle** gallice, uidelicet qui finalem penitentiam sibi repromittunt.

OISOS adj. See F 7.

OR s.m.

4 (106ra) Nota: illi qui acceperunt l'or ploï non possunt de facili rectificari.

ORGUEIL s.m. See A 10.

OSTELIER s.m. See D 18.

OUTRAGE s.m. and f. See F 6.

5 (20vb) Sequitur: ipse pauper contentus paruo non uult **outrage**.

6 (53vb) Prou. [17:25] *Ira patris et dolor matris, filius stultus* etc. Ideo petit licentiam plangendi; hoc non est **outrages**.

7 (102va) Nec mirum si nesciuit habere mensuram, quia spiritus sanctus, qui amor est, datus fuit ei non ad mensuram; de amore suo nesciuit umquam nisi **outrage**.

OUTRAGIER adj. See E 20.

OVRE s.m. and f. = UEVRE.

8 (23vb) Ps. [Ps 6:9] *Discedite a me omnes qui operamini iniquitatem*. . . . Dicitur: ces **ovres** faces tu don tu soies penduz, si quis diceret fabro: "Fac mihi cultellum ut interficiam te."

OVRIER s.m. See F 3.

P

PACIËNCE s.f.

1 (27vb) Et do cordi meo talem formam qualem uolo, etsi non corpori. Vnde informandum est cor en la pacience et gratia. Deus pater nos monstrat in suo *** Ihesu Christo.

PAIEMENT s.m.

2 (16rb) Otiosi non habent expectare mercedem. O quam stultus, si quereretur ab otioso "Quid expectas?" et responderet "paiement."

PAIS s.f. See C 77; F 5; J 5; M 4.

PANETERIE s.f. See B 33.

PAPELARDIE s.f.

3 (97vb) Nota de ueste ueteri redditu uestiario; quando ego facio professionem, do ueterem conuersationem siue corpus Deo, qui ossibus et nervis nos compegit, et tunc assumo nouam conuersationem. Set quidam ueterem uestem reparant, quod signum est **papelardie**, non nobilitatis, ut ille que accipiunt munuscula ad sustentandum corpus et sibi apropiant.

PARÇON s.f. See C 31.

PARDONER vb. See A 56; C 25; E 34.

4 (27vb) Eccli. xxviii^o [28:2] *Relinque proximo tuo nocenti te: pardone proximo tuo illud quod dedit tibi pati, si uis quod Dominus dimittat tibi illud quod ei forefecisti.*

PARER vb.

5 (100ra) *Vnde sicut homo informat calceos in pedibus, robam in dorso, gantos in manibus, ita informatur cor eo quod diligit. Vnde qui amorem retinet uersus creatorem, est indutus de roba a parer.*

PARFONDIR vb. See A 119.

PARFONT s.f. See A 77; C 20.

PARLER vb.

6 (29rb) *Set secundum rationem subiungit in psalmo [Ps 21:2]: longe a salute mea uerba delictorum meorum idest manifesta peccata, quia peccata que uidentur et sciuntur, idest que fiunt in publico, sunt peccata parlant, set peccata operta sunt peccata taisant.*

PARMANANT part. (cf. TL 7:303.20 s.v. parmanoir). See B 19.

PARMI prep. and adv. See E 1.

PARSIVRE vb. See B 21.

PART s.f.

7 (26ra) *Ps. [50:14] Redde michi letitiam salutaris tui. Deus reddit les partes et soluit expansas ut reuertamur et componamus cum eo.*

PARTENIR vb. See E 7.

PARTIE s.f. See J 4.

8 (44rb) *Omnia parata: uenite ad nuptias: Mt. xxii [22:4]. Quomodo eundum? Festinanter, sicut pauperes festinant ad magnam erogationem, gallice de partie.*

PARTIR vb. See M 17.

PARVENIR vb. See M 29.

PASSER vb. See A 60.

9 (22rb) *Quintum et sextum tanguntur Ysa. xiii^o de Nabugodonosor, scilicet letari de dampno alterius. Hoc est primum; et reprover peccatum qui est passez, hoc est secundum.*

10 (36va) *Ps. [85:5] Multe misericordie omnibus inuocantibus te idest ab intus uocantibus, quia petitiones cordis passent in curia Domini et recipiuntur.*

11 (52rb) *Sicut pueri qui passent super glaciem, que fragilis est, et soluitur glacies et submerguntur, ita etc; mundus enim quasi mare congelatum.*

12 (92va) *Homo uitat lutosam uiam quare etc. Nam qui pense, il passe; uia ista polluta est. Ideo debemus passer de lapide in lapidem, ut cogitando de articulis fidei et huiusmodi.*

PASSION s.f. See L 10.

PASTURE s.f.

13 (27va) *Ps. [94:7] Oues pascue eius idest uos qui estis des patures Dei. . . . Vnde quando uado ad sermonem, uado cor meum ponere en pasture. Christus fuit quasi pastor et est cum pascit corda uerbis suis.*

PATERNOSTRE s.f.

14 (67vb) *Et mox audiuit a Domino: Hodie mecum eris etc. [Lc 23:43]. Si uis optinere, non solum petas ore, sicut illi de quibus Ysa. dicit [29:13]: Populus iste labiis me honorat; cor autem eorum longe est a me; tales dicunt la paternostre au*

singe [cf. Hassell P 74]. Orandum est etiam corde: Ps. [36:4] *Dabit tibi petitiones cordis tui.*

PECHIÉ s.m.

15 (34ra) Vnde qui se rembat en pechie, il se rembat in uentre matris sue, et ille dolorem magnum ei facit.

PEINE s.f.

16 (34ra) Nota: Christus dicitur mulier propter amoris teneritudinem, quo parturiuit nos, idest ala en paines, toto tempore uite sue.

PELEE s.f. (cf. Godefroi 10:308b). See A 41.

PENDRE vb. See A 124; D 62.

PENITENCE s.f. See C 62.

PENONCEL s.m.

17 (60rb) Sicut in uastitate hostili fieri solet; in domibus, quas defendere uolunt ab incendiariis hostium suorum, solent principes exercitus facere poni signa sua, gallice pannoncias; sic dominus sanguinem suum tanquam pannoncel defensionis nostre in superliminari memorie nostre et conuersationis nostre exterius per penitentim uult poni ut defendamur a plagis Egypti.

18 (60vb) Nota: tribulationes sunt quasi pannoncel ad saluandum: Ps. [33:7] *Ex omnibus tribulationibus eius saluauit eum.*

PENSER vb. See P 12.

19 (67rb) Eccli. xid [32:15–16] *Precurre primo in domo tua, et illic aduocare, et illic lude, idest pense ad ludum tuum, et age conceptiones tuas.*

20 (100vb) Sequitur: *et in iustitia meditabitur* [Eccli 14:22] idest qui facit iustitiam, par puer pens.

PERE s.m.

21 (44va) Mt. xxii^o [Mt 22:12] *Amice, quomodo huc intrasti non habens uestem nuptialem? . . .* Nota quod nuptie filii Dei et humane nature facte sunt propter caritatem in homine augendam. Vnde nuptie facte sunt propter uestem, non uestis propter nuptias. Hec uestis parat hominem, gallice pere.

PETIT adj. See C 55; G 10.

PETITECE s.f. See B 21.

PHALERER vb. (cf. Godefroi 6:137a). See B 24.

PIÉ s.m. See A 62, 88; D 37.

PLAIE s.f. See C 25.

PLAIN adj. See O 2.

PLAISANT adj. See C 37.

PLAT s.m.

22 (36ra) Nota: Porreta: Percutit nos Dominus in presenti de plat de l'espee, set in futuro de tranchant. Ensis est sententia Domini.

PLAT adj. (cf. TL 7:1111. 26). See A 25.

PLENTÉ s.f. See G 20.

PLENTÉIF adj. See G 4.

PLOR s.m. See A 66.

PLOIIER vb. See O 4.

PLOKER vb. See C 48, 66.

23 (32vb) Nota quando dictum fuit Domino: *Veni et uide* [Jo 11:34], lacrimatus est quia qui uidet, il plore.

POINT s.m. See M 37.

POINTIER vb. See C 79.

POIS s.m. See D 64.

PÔOIR vb. See A 134.

PORLOIGNIER vb. See D 57.

PORPRENDRE vb.

24 (37rb) Item quanto plus uulnera corporis tardant ad remuer, tanto amplius fetent et porprennent et saisiunt et putrefaciunt sanas partes corporis et tunc tarde quando uulnera sunt grauiora ad sanandum.

25 (97va) Et quia humilitas parua, minimum locum occupat, set superbus porprenant magnum locum.

PORSIVRE vb. See D 70.

POSSESSIÖN s.f. See A 134.

POVRETÉ s.f.

26 (19va) Sic ad hoc ut ueniat iste puer ad corda nostra, oportet preparari uiam ut omnis uallis idest cor *** per concupiscentiam que in fossa congregantur le povretez et nichil etc.

PRÈECHIER vb. See B 17.

PRENDRE vb. See A 42; B 20; E 31; G 2.

PRES adv.

27 (20ra) Secundo quando tenet se plus pres et timet sibi magis quam prius. Sic nos quando restringimus appetitus nostros et magis timemus.

28 (82ra) Ysa. xiii [14:1] *Prope est ut ueniat tempus eius, pres est li tens qui doit venir et dies eius non elongabuntur* scilicet ab eo id est non prolongabuntur.

PRESENT s.m.

29 (8vb) Et ideo sequitur [Prov 14:31] *honorat autem eum, qui miseretur pauperis.* Iste honorat Deum par son present.

PRESSE s.f.

30 (52va) Vnde Eccli. v [5:10] *Noli esse anxius in diuitiis iniustis idest iniuste acquisitis uel iniuste detentis, ut qui retinent illas contra necessitatem pauperum.* Nota: tales homines ponunt corda sua en presse per additionem et multiplicationem diuittiarum.

PRESTRE s.m. See M 15.

PRIIER vb. See A 76.

PRISIER vb. See B 22; D 33.

31 (8vb) Sic dedecus facit Deo qui pauperem despicit; set qui tant le prise quod det ei aliquid, ille honorat.

PRIVANCE s.f. See A 23.

PRIVÉ s.m. (cf. TL 7:1908.7).

32 (28rb) prima Thy. v [1 Tim 5:8] *Qui autem suorum et maxime domesticorum curam non habet idest amicorum suorum et maxime de des privez, fidem negauit, et est infideli deterior.*

PRODOMIE s.m.

33 (92vb) *Vita de preudeume est uita obsessa.*

PUISIER vb. See B 6.

Q

QUADRANT s.m. = CADRANT (cf. TL 2:7).

1 (35ra) *Et sequitur: [Mt 5:26] donec reddas nouissimum quadrantem, idest quatuor quadranz idest fides recta, spes certa, dilectio sancta, operatio bona.*

QUELQUE adj. See B 25.

QUERELER vb.

2 (24rb) *Eph. [6:12] *** contra spiritualia, ecce subtilitas, ***, meschies, quando homo nescit se esse in guerra, non cognoscit inimicos, nequitie, ecce crudelitas, in celestibus, idest pro celestibus guerrat, querele, quando aliquis pro hereditate et honore pugnat. . . .*

QUERRE vb. See M 36.

R

RACHIER vb. See B 25; L 6.

1 (92va) *Vel de luto fecis [Ps 39:3]: qui in Deo non est, nusquam est; il est reesgiez extra suum uas.*

RADE adj.

2 (36va) *In fletu uenient ad me; in misericordia reducam eos; et deducam per torrentes aquarum idest tribulationum [Jer 31:9].* Torrens est concursus pluuiarum de montibus rades et subitus qui totum uidetur confundere et tamen cito transit, gallice randis.

3 (56ra) *Vel aliter Tygris rapidus idest rades, quia cito currit.*

RÄENÇON s.f.

4 (93va) *Adoptionem exponit redemptionem corporis nostri scilicet ut ipsum corpus redimatur a mortalitate quod prius fuit emptum a mortalitate, a peccato; adoptionem idest corpus glorificatum et hoc fiet postquam soluerimus redemptionem, la raenson, corporum nostrorum.*

RÄINCIER vb. See F 37.

RAMENTEVOIR vb. See B 29.

5 (53va) *Similiter Dominus mittit ad nos quibus dedit elemosinam suam ut nos inuitent. Item scriptura ramentoit e Chananea, de Magdalena, de Paulo et aliis. Ideo frequentius epistule Pauli et psalmi leguntur in ecclesia.*

6 (68va) *Vir cognoscens defectum et indignantiam suam ramentoit negotium suum ei qui solus uult et potest iuuare dicens: Memento mei Deus etc. [Neh 13:14].*

RAMON s.m.

7 (98ra) *Ps. [113:2] Facta est Iudea sanctificatio eius; Iudea confessio; hec tenet mundum hospitium, quia mundat per scopam, gallice ramon, lingue.*

RAMONER vb. See O 2.

8 (98rb) *Ki ramonue domum alterius, babit de puluere.*

RANDIR vb. See R 2.

RASSEL s.m.

9 (101vb) Triticum extrahitur do rassel et ponitur in area, quando homo de seculo ingreditur in religionem uel peccator de peccato penitentiam ingreditur, ubi flagello penitentie et discipline uerberatur, ut a palea purgetur idest ab amore carnali et huiusmodi.

RASSENER vb.

10 (59rb) Nota: quadruplex est signum. Primum est signum inuentionis, gallice de rassener, ut quando capitur hospitium a militibus, ponitur ad fenestram uel scutum uel huiusmodi ad inueniendum hospitium.

RECOMENCIER vb.

11 (18va) Ecce guerra. Estne aliquis qui pacem faceret cum aduersario suo de eo de quo sciret quod in crastino haberet guerram a recommencier?

RECONSUER vb.

12 (83rb) Ps. [29:12] *Concidisti saccum meum* etc., idest corpus meum, non tantum aperuisti ut habundares, effunderes thesaurum redemptionis et *circumdedisti me letitia*, scilicet in resurrectione, quando ille saccus resutus est, gallice reconsuz.

RECORT s.m.

13 (13rb) Nota quantum est se ponere en recort Domini, quia *a mari habundabit cogitatio eius* [Eccli 24:39].

RECOUPER vb. See C 62.

RECOVRER vb.

14 (98rb) Talis sibi prouidet envers l'iver, qui nunquam hoc bonum est sibi prouidere de celo quamdiu forum misericordie est. Tunc peccator non poterit recoverre.

REDRECIER vb. See C 55.

REFAIRE vb.

15 (46va) Interim cum uocat nos [Mt 11:28]: *Venite, inquit, ad me omnes, qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficam uos*, je vos referai. Sic loquitur qui satur est: "je sui refaiz."

REFONDRE vb.

16 (106ra) Nota quomodo reintegratur denarius par refondre: Rom. [Eph 4:23] *Renovamini spiritu mentis uestre*.

REGARDER vb. See A 118; D 58.

RELIEF s.m.

17 (67ra) Mt xix^o [19:27] *Dixit Petrus Ihesu: Ecce nos relinquimus omnia, et secutus sumus te. . . Relinquimus*, gallice nos a vous de tot fait relief, quia sancti de terrenis fecerunt suum relief et de isto uiuunt mundani.

18 (93va) Nota quod solus homo uiuit in exspectando; non sic bruta animalia, non sic demones nisi expectando unum residuum, gallice relief, quod dabitur eis ex consortio malorum.

REMANDER vb.

19 (16va) Tunc renuntiat Dominus et remande et ponit aliqua signa, sex scilicet per que potest cor cognoscere si gratiam habeat, quia opera dyaboli probant presentiam eius.

REMBATRE vb. See P 15.

REMÜER vb. See P 24.

20 (37rb) Item non est timendus iste medicus [sc. Deus], quia non uenit cum igne aut ferro ad comburendum uel scindendum. Set sola infirmitatis ostensio sufficit. Item sapiens est et propterea nichil querit. Item maiora uulnra siue grauiora prius debent estre remuers.

RENDRE vb. See A 76; C 44.

RENOUER vb.

21 (70rb) Et [1 Mach 4:38] *altare prophanatum* idest cor prophanis usibus deputatum, idest renoiez, et *portas exustas* idest sensus igne concupiscentie combustos, quos omnes creature quasi quidam titiones incendunt et in *atriis uirgulta* idest opera mala et infructuosa.

RENOUÉ adj. (cf. TL 8:822.3).

22 (28ra) Et sicut denaturatus qui non emendat, ita nec uere Christianus, set renoiez qui non perdonat.

REPENTANCE s.f. See C 62, 77.

23 (66rb) Nota: duo sunt quibus emuntur denariate Domini scilicet penitentia corporis et *repentance* cordis.

24 (90va) Vnde eundum est obuiam Domino in confessione peccatorum, en *repentance* cordis et penitentia corporis et misericordia uersus proximum.

25 (99rb) Secundo a contritis de peccato, gallice *repentanz*.

REPROVER vb. See P 9.

REQUERRE vb. See C 61, 78.

RESTORER vb. See D 16.

RESTREINDRE vb.

26 (9rb) Vnde qui plus subtrahit proprie glorie, maiorem locum dat glorie Dei; dignum est ut pro Deo se restraigne.

RETAILLIER vb. See C 62.

RETENIR vb. See A 116; E 44; M 4.

RETRAIRE vb.

27 (59va) Nota de primo signo: quanto cor se magis restringit et apetise, tanto maiorem locum facit Deo. Deus dignus ke ne se retraiet pro ipso.

ROBE s.f. See A 25.

ROGE adj.

28 (92va) Nota de Raab meretrice, Iosue ii, que saluata fuit et omnis domus eius per signum funiculi coccinei idest corde vermeille et *rouge*.

ROTE s.f.

29 (51bis vb) Exemplum e pueru Amalechita qui non potuit tenere *route* circa quem Dauid stetit.

ROTER vb.

30 (44vb) Negligit superbos qui uadunt de humeris quasi deberent *ruter*.

SAGINÉ s.f. (cf. Godefroi 7:282c s.v. *sagine*).

1 (35vb) *Abba i^o e [Hab 1:15] Totum in hamo suo leuauit, traxit illud in sagina sua, gallice saigine, et congregauit illud in rete suum.*

SAISINE s.f. See A 130; E 31, 32, 33; M 28.

2 (88vb) *Nota quod aliqui iam habent terram en saisine scilicet illi qui bene uiuere uolunt penitentes, quibus terra non potest auferri.*

SAISIR vb. See J 4.

3 (98va) *Tantum habet homo etatis, quantum habet uiuere, quia quicquid uixit, mors occupauit, l'a saisi, nec posset homo reuocare, quia nec, que preteriit, rursus reuocabitur unda / nec, que preteriit, hora redire potest* [Ovid, *Ars amatoria* 3.63–64].

SAISON s.f. See C 27, 67.

4 (52vb) *Nota quomodo uenator considerat tempus, loca, bestias de saison. Bestie de saison non sunt pauperes, set diuites.*

5 (94va) *Tertio in finem dilexit nos* [Jo 13:1] idest perseueranter, unde amor finalis est amor perseuerans, qui durat usque in finem: Prou. xvii [17:17]. *Omni tempore diligit qui sapiens est, set est amicus secundum tempus suum et non permanebit* etc. Eccli vi [6:8], ut illi quorum amor non habet nisi unam solam saison. Amor Dei erga nos non fuit de saison, unde non fuit de illis de quibus dicit Tullius: *Sodales uetustos numquam prosequentium nouitate fastidias; procul autem sit uideri [uidere MS] amicis uti quasi floribus tam diu gratis quam diu recentibus.*

SALIETE s.m. (cf. TL 9:112 s.v. *salir*).

6 (18va) *Ymagines lutee sunt visage de salientes plumbate et lucentes extra.*

SANGLENT adj.

7 (86vb) *In hac eradicatione Christus tantum laborauit quod ipse pedes et manus habuit toz sanglanz.*

SANS prep. See A 74; D 61; E 41; F 1.

SARPE s.f. See A 106.

SANC s.m. See A 82; E 1.

SAUVENT M s.m.

8 (24rb) *Ps. [84:10] Prope timentes eum salutare ipsius, leur sauvementz, ut in excercitu, quia non perdit Deum nisi qui non timet eum.*

SAVOIR vb. See A 102; C 44; F 8.

SEIGNOR s.m. See E 25.

SEMBLANT part. (cf. TL 9:402.10 s.v. *sembler*). See F 9.

SEMBLANT s.m. See C 47.

SERREMENT s.m.

9 (53rb) *Constip<ati>o uentris, gallice li serremenz; hoc ad auaritiam; qui retinet sordes quoad hoc quod non sinit confiteri.*

SERRER vb. See A 30.

SERVAGE s.m. See F 34.

SERVIR vb. See D 27.

SIGNIER vb.

10 (23vb) *Nota: de illis sigioient sicut symia, quibus uidetur quod melius facerent ea que uident a prelatis suis uel aliis fieri, sicut oculus non uidet se.*

SINGE s.m. See P 14.

SOFRIR vb. See A 111; B 18, 28; C 1; E 34.

SOHAIDÉOR s.m. Cf. Godefroi 7:507c.

11 (26vb) Nota de sohedeurs ante portas astutiarum.

SOIGNANT s.f.

12 (92vb) Et sic de sponsis Christi fiunt **soignanz** dyaboli, uidue de uiuo marito, set quando ueniet Dominus in die iudicii, cum potestate magna uindicabit se de utroque: Iudic. xiii [15:5].

SOIGNANTAGE s.m. See F 34.

SOING s.m.

13 (26rb) Christus Deus unctus non sicut currus; de **soinz** aliquando facit quod ei dicitur, set cum murmure factus est obediens patri, non carni, mundo uel dyabolo usque ad mortem in difficultibus.

SOL s.m.

14 (39va) Tertia nouitas fuit quod homo Deum et homo hominem generat ex materia et sol.

SOMIER s.m. See D 51.

SOPLE adj. See C 37.

SORMONTER vb.

15 (101rb) Hos equos [sc. tribulationis] **sormonter** debemus per patientiam ut scilicet portando eos portetur ab eis.

SOSTENANCE s.f.

16 (8vb) Nota *de tua* [Prov 3:9] dicit, non de aliena, sicut usurarii, latrones et huiusmodi, substantia, gallice **soustenance**, non de superfluo tantum.

SOUDEE s.f.

17 (66ra) Miles non solet remunerari a principibus, donec fuerit in aliqua probitate probatus, set quidam uolunt recipere les **sodees** ante conflictum.

SOUTENDRE vb. See D 31.

SOVENANCE s.f. See A 120; C 38; O 1.

SÜER vb. See A 54.

T

TABOR s.m. and f. See B 24.

TAIRE vb. See P 6.

TARDIF adj. See H 5.

TART adv. (Cf. TL 10:123.15 s.v. a tart). See M 36.

1 (14va) Hic fallit proverbiu: **A tart** uindicatur quem dominus uindicat [Morawski, p. 6, no. 150].

TAS s.m. See G 14.

TEIGNE s.f. See A 93.

TEMPESTER vb.

2 (35rb) Vnde dicit ignis: "A me combureris"; aqua: "A me submergetis"; terra "A me absorberis"; aer: "A me uentilaberis," omne **tempesterai**.

TENDRIER adj.

3 (53vb) Hodie ecclesia quasi mater **tenriere** incipit quasi deflere exilium et mortem filiorum suorum, quia ut dicitur Prou. [17:25] *Ira patris et dolor matris, filius stultus etc.*

TENÈURE s.f. See M 9.

4 (91ra) Nota totum; set usurarii se excusant quod illi quibus mutuant ad usuram uenderent suas possessiones, **teneures** et huiusmodi, nisi mutuarent.

TENS s.m. See D 57.

5 (94va) Eze. xvi [16:8] *tempus tuum, tempus amantium.* Amor de **tens** est inter malos qui non durat nisi parum.

TERMINE s.m. and f. See A 54.

TERMINER vb. See A 54.

TERRE s.f. See A 25; B 23; L 2.

6 (95vb) Misericordia enim plures fructus affert in macra **terre**.

TORBLER vb. See C 66.

7 (32va) *Turbabuntur* etc. [Ps 64:8] gallice il se **trobleront** de conscientia, quia conscientia turbabit eos.

TORDRE vb. See D 30.

TORS part. (cf. TL 10:413. 30 s.v. tordre). See B 26.

TORTEL s.m. (cf. Godefroi 7:765a).

8 (91ra) Nota quod sua, quia elemosina de proprio debet fieri; non uult Dominus quod de aliena pasta fiat sibi placenta, **tortiaux**.

TORT s.m. See B 20; D 66.

9 (91ra) Vnde similes [sc. usurarii] sunt illis qui uendicant sibi les ***, qui faciunt **tort** tot hominibus quot de eo deberent uiuere.

TOST adv. See A 77.

TOT adj. and adv. See A 3, 25, 76, 128; C 18; D 37, 69; M 20; R 17; S 7.

TOSSIN s.m. See A 36.

TRAIRE vb. See B 27.

TRĀISON s.f. See D 18.

TRANSLATER vb. See C 32.

TRANSMONTAIN adj.

10 (80rb) Naute dirigunt cursum suum ad stellam gallice **transmontene**; stella est *gratia in bono conductu talium uel stella est exempla sanctorum.*

TREBUCHET s.m.

11 (105vb) Iere vig [Jer 6:27] *Probatorem dedi te in populo meo, sicut probatur moneta au trebuchet, quando non habet rectum pondus.*

TRENCHANT s.m. See E 56.

TRENCHE adj. See G 6.

TRESPAS s.m. See B 19.

TRESPASSANT s.m. See E 1.

TRESPASSER vb.

12 (68va) Homo dicitur **trespassez** quando mortuus est.

TRIEGE s.m. (cf. Godefroi 8:74a).

13 (33vb) Sic homo quando perpetrauit peccatum, ueniat ad triache penitentie et ad aquam gratie et misericordie et liberabitur.

TRIBULACIÓN s.f. See F 12.

TRIES s.m. (cf. Godefroi 8:74b).

14 (21rb) Nota: ante aduentum Christi, terra nature humane erat quasi triers dyaboli et graui ariditate percussa.

TROP adv. See A 37; C 36.

TROVER vb. See E 65, 66.

TÜEL s.m. See A 68.

TUMER vb.

15 (15ra) Quicumque consentit peccato mortali, dat funiculo dyaboli ut ducamur ab ipso quocumque voluerit, de uno peccato ad aliud et quasi bos per pratum ad macellum; ubi nondum percipit, accipit securim. . . . Taliter ligatos facit quasi symiam et ludit de eis dyabolus et facit eos tumer quantum ad superbos, quia superbia casum habet [Hassell O 85].

U

UNT adv. = ONT.

USER vb. See A 22; E 62.

UTRAGEUSE adj. = OUTRAJOS. See A 63.

V

VAILANCE s.f.

1 (98rb) Et tantum habemus valens, set quod cadit extra manus suas, per impatientiam perditur.

VAILLANT s.m. (cf. TL 11:104.24 s.v. valoir).

2 (93va) Tant vaillant habemus nos quantum patimur pro Deo uel laboramus et non plus.

VAISSEL s.m. See B 25.

VENIR vb. See A 66; D 57; F 1.

VEOIR vb. See B 20.

VERMEL adj. See A 99; C 58.

VERGE s.f. See C 57.

VERS s.m. See D 54.

VERS prep. See D 58.

VERSER vb. See C 63.

VIANDE s.f. See A 96.

VIE s.f. See M 36.

3 (94rb) Item *in finem dilexit eos* [Jo 13:1] idest ad bona finis, au biens ke ge li aime a la fint, ut ad ueniam, caritatem et huiusmodi siue *in finem dilexit nos* idest ad bonum finem, non sicut illi qui ad bona vie, ut ad honores et similia, amicos diligunt.

VIELLE s.f. See A 110.

VIGEREUS adj. See M 5.

VILENEUS adj. (cf. Godefroi 8:241c).

4 (21ra) numquam habuit aliquis equus tant vilenes evrox quantum equus iste.

VISAGE s.m. See S 6.

VOIEE s.f. See M 7.

VOLOIR See H 6.

VONSEN s.m. See M 27.

W

WAGON s.m. See C 31.

WERIER vb. = GUERRER (cf. TL 4:755).

1 (12ra) De malo debitore debemus accipere quod habere possumus. et ideo Dominus petit, si non soluimus ei penitentiam faciendo, quod saltem ne le werrions mie peccata faciendo.

WYCHET s.m. = GUICHET (cf. TL 4:767).

2 (48ra) Nota de hostio basso et quomodo superbis resistit; quia rigidi incedunt, non possunt intrare par le wychet, set humiles submittunt caput cordis.

OLD FRENCH PROVERBS

1 Qui tant l'emme, tant l'achate [Hassell A 66]. See A 21.

2 Item per famem fugatur dyabolus quant il est afamez, quia fames pellit lupum de silua [Hassell F 1; cf. Bataillon, "Similitudines et exempla," 194]. See A 29.

3 Le trop espargnier et le trop departir ex una parte, li trop afflire ex alia, quia *medium tenuere beati* [cf. Hassell, Appendix M 7], et in gallico Mesure dure [Hassell M 136; Di Stefano, p. 539]. See A 37.

4 Une meime viande assavorer, ut ille idem morcellus qui transit per os corporis transeat per os cordis [cf. Morawski, p. 68, no. 1860]. See A 96.

5 Qui le bien voit et le mal prent, il se fet tort a esciaent [cf. Morawski, p. 68, no. 1852]. See B 20.

6 Et dixit Renardo: "Compere, ego nescio quid habeo." Et ille respondit: "Au rendre le sauras." [cf. Morawski, p. 88, no. 2438]. See C 44.

7 Solet dici quod ille facit bonam dietam qui de fol se descombe, set meliorem dietam facit qui se liberat de iniquo peccato scilicet intus dyabolo [Morawski, p. 10, no. 276; Bataillon and Bériou, "G. de Mailly," 44]. See D 22.

8 Entre deux vers une meure [Morawski, p. 25, no. 694; Hassell V 76]. See D 54.

9 Nimia fertilitas idest plantez trop granz saporem non habet [Morawski, p. 60, no. 1644; Hassell P 195; Di Stefano, p. 695]. See G 20.

10 Cui male accidit, en li mesoffre [Hassell M 103; TL 5:1658.33-34]. See M 22.

11 A tart quiet la viee, qui a la mort le quiet [cf. Morawski p. 6, no. 154]. See M 36.

12 A tart uindicatur quem dominus uindicat [Morawski, p. 6, no. 150]. See T 1.

13 Taliter ligatos facit quasi symiam et ludit de eis dyabolus et facit eos tumer quantum ad superbos, quia superbia casum habet [Hassell O 85]. See T 15.

APPENDIX

Sermon 10 in Paris, BnF lat. 16483 (fols. 21rb–22vb)

Fluuius egrediebatur etc. Gen. ii [2:10]. Eterna generatio et aduentus filii Dei ad nos hic demonstratur locus uoluptatis, Pater a quo Filius egressus est per eternam generationem. Fluuius iste est communis, potabilis, piscabilis etc; quatuor capita in que diuiditur sunt Euphrates, Tygris, Physon et Gyon. Hec sunt quatuor aduentus: in carnem, ad iudicium, in mentem et ad mortem. Nota: ante aduentum Christi terra nature humana erat quasi TRIERS dyaboli et graui ariditate percussa. Vnde ad irrigationem siccitatis nostre et fecundationem sterilitatis nostre uenit Christus.

Ideo fluuio comparatur de primo Iob xii [12:15] *Si continuerit aquas* etc., quia conuerebatur Ysa. Ixii [63:15] *Vbi est zelus tuus* etc., *multitudo uicerum tuorum et miserationum tuarum?* *Super me continuerunt se* etc. Set si emiserit eas, subuentent terram idest subitus uertent affectum terrenum. Nota quomodo terra docet nos quomodo nos debemus habere ad eam in hoc: quod conculcatur, id sustentat. De secundo Ps. [64:10] *Visitasti terram et inebriasti eam.* Terra dicitur inebriari quando intra imbuta est, gallice | ABUVREE. Nota: quidam sunt sicut terra DE CROIE, que non est bibula, et tales non inebriantur, quia non inebriatur nisi qui bibit: Zac. ix [9:15] *Bibentes inebriabuntur.* De utroque Eccli. xxiiii^o [24:41–42] *Ego quasi fluuius Dorex*, quia in medicinam aqua sana, immo sanatiua. Nota de potionibus sancti Remachi. Nota quomodo bibitur trahendo intra. Sequitur: *Dixi: rigabo* *⟨hortum meum⟩ plantationum:* ecce primum. *Et inebriabo prati mei fructus:* ecce secundum. De hoc fluuio Ysa. Ixvi^o [66:12] *Declinabo super eam quasi fluuius pacis; declinabo* idest deorsum clinabo. In hoc notatur quod humilis est, quia ad ualles fluunt aque. Eleua ergo cor tuum, si uis etc.; si ascenderit, elongabit etc. *Super eam, quia merita non possunt attingere* nec cor ausum fuisset petere nec etiam cogitare; *flumen pacis*, quia pacifice fluit etc. silentio. Hec sunt aque Syloe: Ysa. viii^o [53:7] *Obmutescit et non aper*⟨i⟩*et os suum;* eodem xlvi^o [42:14] *Silui, patiens fui;* Iob iii [3:26] *Nonne silui?* *Nonne quieui?*

Vnde Tygris primus; hoc ad primum aduentum, quia rapidus sicut in primo aduentu: Ysa. lix^o [59:17] *Indutus est uestimentis ultionis* idest carne contra dyabolum; et post [59:18] *cum uenerit quasi fluuius uiolentus, quem spiritus Domini cogit.* Amor intulit ei uiolentiam. Venit quasi ENRAGIEZ ET OUTRAGIEZ amator. Ideo bene Tygris, quia tygris animal est uelocissimus et uehemens amatrix sui fetus; proicit se in mare post eum. Hic tigris uadit contra Assyrios idest sublimes. Et Christus superborum et sublimium colla propria uirtute, que est humi- | litas, calcauit. Vel Assyrii sunt demones: Ps. [73:13] *Contribulasti capita draconum in aquis* et hoc maxime in aperatione lateris Christi. Hic Egyptii mersi sunt in mari. Hic aduentus figuratus est in *** ostensa Moysi: Exo iiiii^o; eiusdem xxiiii^o [33:13] *Si inueni gratiam in conspectu tuo, ostende michi faciem tuam, ut sciām te.* Nota totum.

Physon oris mutatio; hoc ad secundum. Tunc loquetur nobis de alio Martino: Ysa xxviii [28:11] *In loquela labii et lingua altera loquetur ad populum istum, quia modo cum obsecratione loquitur ut pauper:* Prou. xix [18:23]. Set tunc ut diues effabitur

21va

21vb

rigide, modo rogando *et* promittendo, tunc precipiendo et comminando: Ysa xxx^o [30:27] *Labia eius repleta sunt indignatione*. Et post sequitur de fluuio [30:28] *Spiritus eius uelut torrens inundans usque ad medium colli*: Dan vii [7:10] *Fluuius igneus rapidus* *que egrediebatur a facie eius* idest a presentia. Amos v^o [5:24] *Reuelabitur quasi aqua iudicium et iustitia quasi torrens fortis*. Hic circuit terram Eiulath idest parturientes; tales [traales MS] trahet aqua ista: Judith vi [Jud 5:21] *Torrens traxit cadauera*. Sicut qui usque ad collum est in aqua currente, necesse habet trahi; Ysa xiii [13:8] *Torsiones et dolores tenebunt; quasi parturiens dolebunt*. Hoc quando traducent eos ex aduersa iniquitate eorum. Sap iiiii [4:20]. Hic de rubo ardente non consumpto. Rubet peccatum: Iob xx [20:18] *Luet omnia que fecit nec tamen consumetur*. Nota de mutatione oris; homo cognoscitur ad suum linguagium. Vnde sic si das quereretur ab Anglico unde esset et responderet de Francia, posset ei dici quod "non, | quia non loqueris linguagium Francie, set Anglie." 22ra

Sic sunt septem linguagia per que cognoscitur quis unde sit, de celo uel de inferno. Quatuor tanguntur in Luc. xvi [16:24].

Primum est uerbum adulatio[n]is, ut quando dicitur bonum coram illis qui reportant eis qui laudantur, quod notatur ibi [Lc 16:24] *Pater Abraham, miserere mei*, dixit diues epulo. Illum uocabat patrem EN LOSENGET, cuius numquam uoluit esse filius et Dominus numquam uoluit laudare Iohannem, nisi quando recesserant discipuli eius. Sic etc. Hoc est contra illos qui adulantur prelatis coram.

Secundum est uerbum presumptionis, unde quando queritur ab illis seruitum cui seruire uolumus, quod notatur ibi [Lc 16:24] *Mitte Lazarum* etc. Ille solus meretur esse seruus Dei in celo qui ei seruiuit in hoc mundo, et etiam quod plus est, qui Deo seruit, Deum DESERT.¹ Set uerbum humilitatis uelle ministrare et non ministrari, et ideo econtrario Petrus Ruanensis: *Adhuc diuitem sua malitia non deserit, qui non se ad Lazarum duci postulat, set a(d) se Lazarum uult deduci*.² Et unde et quo? *Ad infernum de gremio patris, ad profundum chaos de solio sublimi*. Crisostomos: *Qui in pretiosis excessit in culpa uilissima petit in pena*. Nota: de primo uocat patrem quem noluit imitari. Petrus Ruanensis: *Qui genitoris opera non facit, negat genus, dicente Domino: Si filii Abrahe estis, opera Abrahe facite*: Io viii^o [8:39].³

Tertium est uerbum murmurationis et impatientie ibi [Lc 16:24], *quia crucior in hac flamma, quasi diceret, Dominus | dat michi maximam disciplinam*. Non cognoscet quod peccato suo deber(e)tur talis pena. Non sic latro: Luc xxiii^o [23:41] *Nos quidem iuste, nam digna factis recipimus; iste non conquerebatur*. 22rb

Quartum est uerbum carnalitatis ibi *Rogo te, pater, ut mittas eum in domo patris mei; habeo enim quinque fratres, ut testetur illis* [Lc 16:27–28]. Sic aliqui in religione carnali affectione moti malunt amicos suos esse diuites in seculo quam ueniant in locum tormentorum scilicet in religionem. Nota de uerbis carnalibus, de [de de MS] brodio et carne et huiusmodi.

¹ Cf. Hassell, *Middle French Proverbs*, 229, S 80.

² Peter of Ravenna, *Sermo* 122 (PL 52:534B).

³ Peter of Ravenna, *Sermo* 123 (PL 52:537A).

Quintum et sextum tanguntur Ysa. xiii^o de Nabugodonosor, scilicet letari de dampno alterius, hoc est primum; et REPROVER peccatum qui est PASSEZ, hoc est secundum.

Septimum est uerbum desperationis Sap v^o [5:3] *Dicent inter se penitentiam agentes et pre angustia spiritus gementes*. Hii sunt quos aliquando habuimus in derisum etc. Linguagia celi sunt gratiarum actio etc. Ysa. li^o [51:3] *Gaudium et letitia inuenientur in ea, gratiarum actio et uox laudis.*

Gyon terre scilicet mors. In morte redditur homo matri sue idest terre: Eccl xli^o [Eccli 41:13] *Omnia, que de terra sunt, in terram conuertentur*; eiusdem xl [40:1] idest usque in diem sepulture matris omnium ibi uenit Deus: Ps [100:1-2] *Psallam, et intelligam in uia immaculata, quando uenies ad me*, glossa, in morte.⁴ Hic circuit terram Ethyopie que interpretatur caligo uel tenebre: Tren ii [Lam 2:1] *Quomodo obtexit caligine*. Hic de Elya in hostio spelunce. Nota de pallio. | Eufrates aduentus gratie qui frugifer interpretatur.⁵ Hic non dicitur aliquam terram circuire: Iob ix [9:11] *Si uenerit ad me, non uidebo eum* etc. Hoc in nebula templi significatum est.

University of Toronto.

⁴ Peter Lombard, *Commentarium in psalmos* 100.2 (PL 191:901C).

⁵ Jerome, *Liber interp. Hebr. nom.* 5.16 (CCL 72:65).

PS.-ALBERT THE GREAT ON THE PHYSIOGNOMY OF JESUS AND MARY*

Irven M. Resnick

EARLY Christianity produced several literary accounts to support specific iconographic depictions of Jesus, Mary, and the saints, which seek ultimately to establish that one can state authoritatively what each one actually looked like. For example, the legendary veil of Veronica pretends to offer a true image of Jesus's visage that had been transferred to her cloth as Jesus wiped his face on the road to Calvary.¹ Similarly, the legend of Abgar of Edessa provides both a literary and iconographic basis for a description of Jesus' physical appearance. According to one version of the probably third-century legend of Abgar, Hanan, Abgar's archivist and painter, had been charged to paint a portrait of Jesus. When he completed his task he brought the holy image back with him to Edessa, where it became an object of veneration.² In an alternative account, Jesus provided Abgar with a self-portrait.³

Similarly, the apostle Luke is said to have painted an authoritative image of the Virgin Mary, which was then left to the Church. Later Byzantine theologians commonly affirmed the authenticity of both the portrait of Jesus sent to Abgar of Edessa and Luke's portrait of Mary.⁴ A picture of the Virgin in Rome's S. Maria Maggiore is ascribed to Luke.

* I would like to express my gratitude to the National Endowment for the Humanities for financial support that enabled me to begin work on this paper; and, to the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, which kindly opened its facilities to me as a visiting scholar during the summer months of 2000.

¹ One version of the legend of Veronica's veil can be found, for example, in the apocryphal *Death of Pilate (Mors Pilati)*. In this work, as in the legend of Abgar of Edessa, the image of Jesus has a miraculous healing power. For the history of the image, see Ewa Kuryluk, *Veronica and Her Cloth: History, Symbolism, and Structure of a "True" Image* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991).

² *The Teaching of Addai*, trans. George Howard, Early Christian Literature Series 4, Texts and Translations 16 (Chico, Ca., 1981), 9. For this Syriac text and tradition, see also the *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*, ed. Alain Desreumaux, Apocryphes 3 (Turnhout, 1993).

³ Another version of the legendary correspondance between Abgar and Jesus, although without reference to the portrait, is found in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.13.

⁴ See, for example, chap. 69 of Theodore the Studite's *vita* (PG 99:178D).

Regardless of their authenticity, these legends would establish an authoritative basis for venerated depictions of Jesus and Mary by arguing for their apostolic origin. In the absence of traditions for apostolicity, claims of miraculously produced images (*acheiropoietai*) of the saints serve the same purpose.⁵ Whereas legends such as these provided to churchmen from late antiquity and the early Middle Ages a foundation from which to fashion images of Jesus, Mary, and the saints, their role was, in at least one scholastic text from the thirteenth century, usurped by a discussion rooted in physiognomy. Physiognomy will provide an opportunity to fashion depictions of Jesus and Mary on an allegedly *scientific* basis. In the following, I intend to examine a portion of one scholastic text, Ps.-Albert the Great's *Mariale* or *CCXXX quaestiones super Evangelium "Missus est"* (*quaestiones* 17–20), as a sort of case study of the impact of physiognomy on theology.

I. PHYSIOGNOMY AS SCIENCE IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

As indicated above, although these iconographic legends and others remained popular in medieval Latin Christendom,⁶ it fell to thirteenth-century scholastics to attempt a *scientific* account of the physical appearance of Jesus and Mary. The possibility of such an account depended first on the introduction of ancient Greek medical texts and treatises on physiognomy. Although a few pre-scholastic authors reveal some acquaintance with physiognomy, a genuine interest in and systematic account of physiognomy is entirely absent among them.⁷ For the scholastics, the most influential treatises on physiognomy were those attributed erroneously to Plato (or other ancient worthies),⁸

⁵ For a discussion of *acheiropoietai*, see Ernst Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 8 (1954): 112–15.

⁶ For example, Albert the Great mentions (following Eusebius of Caesarea) that the woman who was healed by Jesus of a bloody flux (cf. Luke 8:43 f.) "had an image made in the likeness of the Saviour" ("ad similitudinem Salvatoris fecit fieri imaginem"), dressed it in garments like those he wore, and placed it in her garden. Any herb that grew under the image also enjoyed the power to cure this bloody flux. See *In Evangelium Lucae* 8:43, ed. A. Borgnet, *Opera omnia*, 38 vols. (Paris, 1890–99), 22:580.

⁷ Boethius briefly discusses physiognomy. See his *Interpretatio priorum analyticorum Aristotelis* 2.28 (PL 64:712A–B). John of Salisbury also mentions the teaching of the physiognomists (which John knew from Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis Historia*) but only in passing. See *Policraticus* 5.15, ed. C. C. J. Webb, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1909), 1:345. Nevertheless, physiognomy was popular among Roman authors and its principles were certainly known to some early Christian writers. For discussion, see Elizabeth C. Evans, "The Study of Physiognomy in the Second Century A.D.," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 72 (1941): 96–108.

⁸ For a collection of such treatises, see especially *Scriptores physiognomonici Graeci et*

and to Aristotle. The Aristotelian, or rather pseudo-Aristotelian materials, include the *Secretum secretorum*—introduced to the court of Frederick II in the long form translated by Philip of Tripoli⁹—and Ps.-Aristotle's *Physiognomy*, translated by Bartholomew of Messina sometime before 1262, although a draft or outline of the work seems to have been available earlier.¹⁰ These works, as well as Arabic sources that transmitted their doctrines, presented to the Latin world the physiognomy of the ancients.

Most important, it was in the thirteenth century that physiognomy as a science was seen as a proper instrument for discerning in the outward appearance of a human (or animal) the accidental properties of the soul. In other words, the external appearance, when properly interpreted, became a mirror of the inner being and could reveal its nature.¹¹ It is not coincidental, then, that Michael Scot, translator of Aristotle's *Historia animalium*, left us also a *Liber phisionomiae*—better known in the Renaissance under the title *De secretis nature*. This *Liber phisionomiae* constitutes the third book of his tripartite *Liber introductorius*, and follows after the *Liber quattuor distinctionum* and *Liber particularis*. It has been described as the first true work on physiognomy composed in the medieval West.¹² Dedicated to Frederick II, Michael

Latini, ed. R. Foerster, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1893; rpt. Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1994). For the very popular anonymous treatise *De physiognomia liber* with a French translation, see *Anonyme Latin Traité de physiognomie*, trans. Jacques André (Paris, 1981).

⁹ For a brief summary, see William Eamon's *Science and the Secrets of Nature: Books of Secrets in Medieval and Early Modern Culture* (Princeton, 1994), 45–49. For the claim that Michael Scot used Philip of Tripoli's translation at Frederick II's court, see Steven J. Williams, "The Early Circulation of the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Secret of Secrets* in the West: The Papal and Imperial Courts," *Micrologus: Natura, scienze e società medievali*, vol. 2: *Le scienze alla corte di Federico II* (Turnhout, 1994), 127–44, and esp. 136.

¹⁰ Danielle Jacquot suggests that, based on similarities found between Michael Scot's *Liber phisionomiae* and Ps.-Aristotle's *Physiognomy*, perhaps an outline of the latter was introduced at the court of Frederick II. See Danielle Jacquot, "La physiognomonie à l'époque de Frédéric II: Le traité de Michel Scot," *Micrologus 2: Le scienze alla corte di Federico II*, 25. Ps.-Aristotle's text on physiognomy was frequently commented on. For a discussion of John Buridan's fourteenth-century commentary, see Lynn Thorndike, "Buridan's Questions on the Physiognomy Ascribed to Aristotle," *Speculum* 18 (1943): 99–103. For a translation of Ps.-Aristotle's *Physiognomica*, see *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. Jonathan Barnes, 2 vols. (Princeton, N.J., 1984), 1:1237–50. For some discussion of Ps.-Aristotelian texts on physiognomy in the Latin medieval world, see Charles Schmitt, "Pseudo-Aristotle in the Latin Middle Ages," in *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jill Kraye, W. F. Ryan, and C. B. Schmitt (London, 1986), 6–7.

¹¹ For this theme, see especially Jole Agrimi, "Fisiognomica: nature allo specchio ovvero luce e ombre," *Micrologus 4: Il teatro della natura* (Turnhout, 1996), 129–78.

¹² See Danielle Jacquot, "La Physiognomonie à l'époque de Frédéric II: Le traité de Michel Scot," 20. Michael's authorship of the *Liber phisionomiae* or, in general, of the *Liber introductorius*, seems well established but Charles Burnett, noting the extensive use Bartholo-

Scot composed the work to enable the emperor to distinguish, from outward appearances, trustworthy and wise counselors from their opposite numbers. Such a science is so useful to a ruler that Michael Scot does not hesitate to describe it as a “doctrine of salvation.”¹³ Nor is it coincidental that Albert the Great devoted two questions to a defense of physiognomy in his *Quaestiones super de animalibus*,¹⁴ or that a large section of the first book of his *De animalibus* is given over to the study of physiognomy, sometimes circulating independently under the title *De physiognomia*.¹⁵ About the time of the composition of *De animalibus*—ca. 1263—physiognomy was becoming well integrated into the study of science and natural philosophy in medieval Europe.¹⁶

Albert, in particular, devotes the second chapter of the first book of his *De animalibus* to the “science of physiognomy.” There he proposes to reveal how “physiognomy . . . teaches one to make predictions about human dispositions using the physical shapes of their members.”¹⁷ Among human beings, then,

mew of Parma made of Michael’s work, has suggested that Bartholomew edited Michael’s *Liber particularis* and *Liber quattuor distinctionum*. Therefore, he warns, “great caution must be exercised in accrediting anything in the *Liber introductorius* to Michael.” See Charles Burnett, “Michael Scot and the Transmission of Scientific Culture from Toledo to Bologna via the Court of Frederick II Hohenstaufen,” *Micrologus 2: Le scienze alla corte di Federico II*, 117.

¹³ “Phisionomia est doctrina salutis: electio boni et vitatio mali, comprehensio virtutis et praetermissio vitiorum. Hoc autem inducit verus amor dei . . .” (Michael Scot, *Liber phisionomiae*, proemium). I have used the Venice edition (1477). At least eighteen editions appeared subsequently, indicating the popularity of the work.

¹⁴ Albert the Great, *Quaestiones super de animalibus* 1.21–22, ed. Ephrem Filthaut, *Opera omnia* 12 (Münster, 1955), 94–96.

¹⁵ See P. G. Meersseman, *Introductio in opera omnia B. Alberti Magni O.P.* (Bruges, 1931), 139. Note too that in *De animalibus* 23.1.46 Albert alludes to a work of his own with the title *Physonomia*; see Albertus Magnus, *On Animals: A Medieval Summa Zoologica*, trans. Kenneth F. Kitchell, Jr., and Irven Michael Resnick, 2 vols. (Baltimore and London, 1999), 1573. In all references to *De animalibus* the Latin text and the book, chapter, and paragraph numbers (or book, treatise, chapter, and paragraph numbers) are from Hermann Stadler’s edition, *De animalibus libri XXVI*, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* 15 and 16 (Münster, 1916–21); the English translation is cited by page number.

¹⁶ For a review of the route by which physiognomy entered into medieval science and philosophy, see Jole Agrimi, “*Fisiognomica e ‘Scolastica,’*” *Micrologus 1: I discorsi dei corpi* (Turnhout, 1993), 235–71.

¹⁷ “. . . physonomia . . . divinare docet de affectibus hominum per physicas formas membrorum” (Albert the Great, *De animalibus* 1.2.2.126; *On Animals*, 93). No good studies of Albert’s treatment of physiognomy exist, although two treatments appeared before WWII comparing some of Albert’s views with the racial science of pre-war Germany. See Hans Scharold’s “Die Physiognomie des Albertus Magnus und die moderne Wissenschaft,” *Bayerische Blätter für das Gymnasial-Schulwesen* 68/5 (1932): 289–301; and F. M. Barbado, “La physionomie, le tempérament et le caractère, d’après Albert le Grand et la science moderne,” *Revue Thomiste* 36 (1931): 314–51.

certain predictable forms of behavior arise from our physical constitutions: from the humoral complexion and the form or arrangement of our members. This is not to say that we are pre-determined to act in a certain way at birth but only that since the soul is united to the body, the body can affect the soul, just as the rational soul, when properly developed, can (and ought to) govern the desires and inclinations of the body. To the extent that our behavior can be traced back to a rational will, Albert will discuss it in his commentary on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*; to the extent that it is affected and revealed by the body, he will discuss it under the science of physiognomy. Albert's named authorities in the discussion of this science are Aristotle (or Ps.-Aristotle), Avicenna, Constantine the African,¹⁸ Loxus, and Palemon.¹⁹ These, as well as a few authors on judicial astrology—since the stars may also affect the disposition of the matter when the body is formed—provide Albert with the principles of a science of physiognomy.

Although physiognomy may examine all of the members of the body to determine the inclinations or passions of the soul—i.e., the character of the individual—it is the face and those organs nearest the brain that have an especially exalted place for the physiognomist.²⁰ Highest among them will be the eyes. Albert remarks that “The entire perfection of physiognomy exists in the eyes. For Palemon says they are like the ‘flowers of the soul,’ that the soul shines forth through the eyes and that their sole disposition is to be an entrance through which the character can be viewed. . . . For this reason all the physiognomists are as one in claiming that the eye is the true messenger of the heart.”²¹

After the eyes, the appearance of the forehead, nose, lips, mouth, hair, ears, neck, groin and genitals, the hue of the skin, and the body's posture and movements seem to present the clearest indications of character. The indications provided by any one of these alone will be insufficient for a secure

¹⁸ For a brief discussion of Constantine's life and sources for his biography, see Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny, “Translations and Translators,” in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable, with Carol D. Lanham (Cambridge, Mass., 1982; rpt. Toronto, 1991), 422–26.

¹⁹ For the identity of Loxus and Palemon, see Albertus Magnus, *On Animals*, 94 n. 206, and Foerster's *Scriptores physiognomonici Graeci et Latini* 1:xviii–xix., lxxv–lxxvi, and clxxvii–clxxviii.

²⁰ Albert the Great, *Quaestiones super de animalibus* 1.22, ed. Filthaut, 96.6–7: “Maxime enim accipitur physiognomia respectu faciei et partium anteriorum, quae vicinantur cerebro.”

²¹ “In oculis autem principaliter consistit omnis perfectio physiognomiae. Dixit enim Palemon oculos esse tamquam flores animae, et animam emicare per oculos, et solam oculorum dispositionem esse aditum, per quem animus intropisci possit. . . . Propter quod etiam oculum verum cordis esse nuntium affirmaverunt omnes simul physiognomi” (Albert the Great, *De animalibus* 1.2.3.142; *On Animals*, 99).

judgment. Michael Scot cautions that the physiognomist should gather together the indications of the *entire* body, and consider also a number of other variables (the person's age, period of residence in a particular area, medical history, and other accidental conditions).²² But when the indicators are in general agreement with one another the physiognomist can arrive at a seemingly scientific conclusion.

When the principles of this science are applied, they can produce allegedly reliable evaluations of character. For example, Albert the Great avers, "Reddish eyes that bulge for a long time signify a lecherous, voracious person. Very small, bulging eyes are a strong indication of one who is very greedy for gain."²³ One can deduce other character traits from the appearance of the nose or nostrils:

When the nostrils are sharp at the tip, they indicate a person quick to anger. When they are inordinately thick, they announce that the person is to be thought of as foul. When the bottoms of the nostrils are solid and round, blunt as it were, they declare him strong and great-hearted. Plato felt that such nostrils were given to leonine and well-born "canine" men. This is because he saw such nostrils on lions and well-born dogs and he said that a certain likeness exists between various animals and men and that people imitate the habits of such animals.²⁴

Plato's (more probably, Palemon's) observation that this type of nostril typically appeared in only well-born or noble animals, and that a certain analogy exists between humans and animals, leads to the conclusion that in humans too "the nostrils [that] are solid and round" indicate one who is "strong and great-hearted." In like manner, bodily proportions are held to be instructive. Thus, following a discussion of the anatomy, function, and shape of the genitals, Albert adds,

Philemon says that the space which extends from below the navel [*umbilicus*] to the bottom of the *pecten* [the groin area] must be measured, as must that which extends from the *umbilicus* to the beginning of the neck at the clavicles.

²² Michael Scot, *Liber phisionomiae* 102.

²³ "Stantes [occuli] autem diu et subrubentes libidinosum significant et voracem. Stantes autem et breves valde significant multum avarum lucrorum" (Albert the Great, *De animalibus* 1.2.3.144; *On Animals*, 100–101).

²⁴ "Nares autem cum in extremo acutae sunt, facilem ad iracundiam hominem ostendunt. Crassae autem extra modum nares immundum hominem dant intelligi. Cum ima narum solida sunt rotunda, tamquam sint obtusa, fortem dicunt et magnanimum. Tales enim nares Plato censuit dari leoninis hominibus et caninis generosis, eo quod in leonibus et canibus generosis tales nares videbat. Dicebat enim, quod quaecumque similitudo animalium aliquorum in hominibus est, quod et homines talium imitantur mores animalium . . ." (ibid. 1.2.8.223; *On Animals*, 129–30, slightly modified).

For these distances are naturally equal in a fully extended man. If it is equal, then this signifies praiseworthy mental power and bodily disposition. If, however, the chest is longer, the power of the mind will overcome the condition of the body. . . . But if the span of the belly is longer than that above, the man will be voluptuous and a fornicator. . . . Loxus says that a softer, fairly concave belly is a sign of power and magnificence of the mind. Aristotle, however, says that one who has a large belly is indiscrete, dull, haughty, and loves the act of intercourse. A moderate sized belly, along with a corresponding narrowing of the chest, indicates loftiness of intellect and good counsel.²⁵

Finally, not only do the members of the body reveal the accidental attributes of the soul (i.e., character), but so too do the body's movements:

A person's gait, proceeding as it does from the inclination of his nature, announces what his mind is like and what his habits are. Thus, those who go forward with long steps are shown to be great-hearted and effective, while those who go forward with shortened steps are ineffective, pusillanimous, niggardly, and afflicted by grief.²⁶

Once again, in isolation these physical indicators might not provide useful information to the physiognomist, but the accumulated weight of evidence—based on the formation of many of the members of the body—was accepted as having probative value. Consequently, the modern reader must bear patiently with a scholastic inclination to enumerate and catalogue evidence drawn from physiognomy. This patience will be rewarded, since this evidence was utilized in the Middle Ages not only as a guide to the character and habits of individuals, but also as an ethnological indicator of the character of peoples or races. The *Polemonis de physiognomonia liber* devotes a good deal of attention to the characteristics of the inhabitants of various regions, identifying the Greeks

²⁵ “Dicit enim Phylemon metiendum esse spatium, quod est ab umbilico inferius usque ad imum pectinis, et spatium quod est ab umbilico usque ad colli initium in furculis: hoc enim in bene extenso homine secundum naturam aequale est: et siquidem aequale est, laudabilem significat et animi virtutem et corporis dispositionem. Si autem pectus longius sit, vincet animi virtus corporis habitudinem. . . . Si autem spatium ventris vincit spatium superius, erit fornicator et voluptuosus. . . . Ventrem autem molliorem atque impressiorem virtutem animi et magnificientiam dicit Loxus significare. Aristoteles autem dicit, quod qui magnum ventrem habet, est indiscretus, stolidus, superbus et coitum amans. Mediocritas autem ventris cum competenti strictura pectoris significat altitudinem intellectus et boni consilii” (ibid. 1.2.24.469; *On Animals*, 225, modified). For a discussion of some of these indicators, see Sebastian Killermann, “Die somatische Anthropologie bei Albertus Magnus,” *Angelicum* 21 (1944): 224–69.

²⁶ “Incessus quoque hominis ex inclinatione naturae procedens annuntiat de eo qualis sit animi et qualium morum: qui enim longis passibus incedunt, magnanimi esse significantur et efficaces. Qui vero angustis passibus incedunt, inefficaces sunt parvae mentis et parci atque dolore astricti . . .” (Albert the Great, *De animalibus* 1.2.26.510; *On Animals*, 241).

in particular as having a pure and well-balanced complexion.²⁷ In a similar way Michael Scot distinguishes the physical features of peoples in different geographical regions:

In warm regions the native peoples (*gentes*) have brown skin, as is evident among the Ethiopians. . . . They have dry curly hair and they have hair that is coarse and rough. But in cold regions tall people are born and they have a very pale or white skin. They are denuded of hair or almost so, especially those who are very pale or white. Note too that a region varies by province and, with respect to a woman's womb, if both are warm, then the creature generated will be warm and the one generated will be black or brown, etc. But if both are cold, then [the creature] will be more or less white according to the complexion of the region.²⁸

From this it is clear that the body and its appearance is affected by conditions of the womb and, later, by climate and geography. Albert the Great provides another witness and notes that "Hair also differs according to the diversity of regions, for diversity of dwelling place also causes diversity of complexion, even among those living in them. For the hair of men who are in warm places is hard and curly, as is the hair of the Ethiopians. But the hair of those in cold places is soft."²⁹ Albert's remarks, like those of Michael Scot, are not merely intended to reflect observable differences among races or peoples in different parts of the world, but also to suggest an accompanying character appropriate to each. Thus,

²⁷ *Polemonis de physiognomia liber* 35, ed. G. Hoffmann in Foerster, *Scriptores physiognomici*, 242–44.

²⁸ "In calida regione sunt gentes native brunae in pelle: ut patet de aethyopibus. . . . Et in crine [reading *crine* for *cane*] sunt siccæ: crispæ: capillos habent et grossos et asperos. Et in frigida regione nascuntur gentes longæ: in pelle multum albae aut blundæ: nudaæ a pilis vel quasi qui in suo esse sunt extensi albi vel blundi. Nota quia regio est multiplex in provincia et matrice mulieris: quæ si utraque fuerit calida creatura generatur: et generata manet nigra vel bruna et caetera. Et si fuerit frigida efficitur alba plus et minus secundum regionis complexionem" (Michael Scot, *Liber phisionomiae* 43).

²⁹ "Diversantur etiam pili secundum diversitatem regionum, ideo quod diversitas habitationis diversitatem facit complexionum etiam in habitantibus in eis: quoniam pili hominum qui sunt in locis calidis, sunt duri et crisi sicut sunt pili Ethiopum: et habitantibus in locis frigidis sunt molles . . ." (Albert the Great, *De animalibus* 3.2.2.82; *On Animals*, 385). See also 19.6.28 (*On Animals*, 1346), where Albert explains that curly hair results from the dryness and earthiness in the vapor in the hair's matter, and "Ethiopians . . . who dwell in hot and dry places, have curly hair, rather like grains of pepper. They have this due both to the dryness of the vapor and to the dryness of the exterior, surrounding air" ("Ethiopes autem in siccis et calidis locis habitantes pilos crisperos ad modum granorum piperis habent tum propter siccitatem vaporis tum propter siccitatem exterioris aerem continentis"). Cf. Albert's *Quaestiones super de animalibus* 19.7–9, ed. Filthaut, 305–7.

Erect hair, either black or the color of water, and which is dirty and coarse, bespeaks a violent character. Such people are like the boar or pig which has this sort of hair and the boar is violent, as is the pig. Soft hair, however, that is sparse and ultra-fine, indicates a lack of red blood and bespeaks a dull, slow character. If the hair is too curly, it is giving notice of a crafty, harsh, timid person who is greedy. If the hair is pressed down too much and hangs over the forehead, it announces a wild character and in this it resembles the hair on a bear's head, which is the reason Plato called such men "ursine." . . . Blond hair and thick white hair say the people are ignorant and fierce. Such is the hair of those who live very far to the North.³⁰

Similarly, just as hair color can say a great deal about a people so too for skin color:

The physiognomy of the skin is assigned by the wise man Phylemon, who says that a soft, dark color indicates a clever, timid person and refers to those who live in the first four *climata*. A fair, pink color, however, indicates brave, spirited people, and this is especially a trait of those living in Germany and inhabitants of the sixth and seventh *climata*.³¹

In a very real sense, then, physiognomy was linked to several disciplines: to zoology, for its discussion of animals and their characteristics and temperaments; to medicine and anatomy, for its discussion of the human body and its organs and operations; and to ethnology or anthropology for a discussion of

³⁰ ". . . capilli stabiles vel nigri vel aquatichi coloris sordidi et crassi animum indicant violentum: et a pro sunt similes tales vel sui quae talem habet capillaturam, et violentus est aper et etiam sus. Capilli autem molles et rari et ultra modum tenues rubei penuriam indicant sanguinis, et ebies ingenium et pigrum praeloquuntur. Si autem sint capilli nimium crisi, pronuntiant subdolum, asperum, timidum et lucri cupidum. Capilli vero depresso nimium et fronti imminentes ferum declarant animum: et hiis concordat capitinis ursini capillatura: propter quod et tales ursinos homines Plato esse pronuntiavit. . . . Capilli autem flavi et crassi albidi, indociles dicunt esse et feros, sicut est capillatura eorum qui multum sunt ad Aquilonem" (Albert the Great, *De animalibus* 1.2.2.132–33; *On Animals*, 95–6)

³¹ "Physonomia autem huius assignatur a Phylemone sapiente, qui dicit, quod color niger lenis versutum indicat et imbecillem et refertur ad habitatores qui habitant quatuor prima *climata*. Color autem albus rubeus, fortes et animosos ostendit: et hic est habitantium in Germania praecipue et habitatorum sexti et septimi *climatum*" (ibid. 1.3.7.623; *On Animals*, 284, slightly modified).

The *climata* are the longitudinal bands into which medieval geographers divided the world. For Albert, there are seven *climata*, divided according to differences in longitude and latitude. For each *clima* there will be a balanced complexion appropriate to it, so much so that "a Dacian who nears balance of complexion for his habitation would quickly die in India or Ethiopia, and it is the same for other differences in *clima*" ("Dacus autem attingens aequale complexionis suae habitationis cito moreretur in India vel Ethiopia, et sic est de aliis climatum differentiis," ibid. 12.1.4.59; *On Animals*, 915).

the generally recognized characteristics and temperaments of groups. As a practical science, it could provide useful information both about individuals and races. From external appearances, the physiognomist might infer a great deal about moral character, mental abilities, and the passionnal nature. Michael Scot certainly believed that this science would prove especially useful at court, as rulers sought to identify trustworthy and wise counselors.

By the fourteenth century the claims of physiognomists must also have achieved a wide popular acceptance, as evidenced by Chaucer's use in sketching the pilgrims in the *Canterbury Tales*.³² From the physical descriptions of the Pardoner or the Reeve, Chaucer's readers would certainly have deduced the most important features of their character. Yet, popular familiarity with the conventions of physiognomy likely did not stem from widespread acquaintance with scholastic works of natural science but from their application in pastoral or ordinary religious contexts. For physiognomy to acquire a foothold in religious discourse, it had first to prove its value to theologians.

II. PHYSIOGNOMY AND SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY

By the thirteenth-century, theologians had put to good use information shared between medicine and physiognomy: in particular, the doctrine of complexion. According to Avicenna's definition in his influential *Canon of Medicine*, "complexion is that quality which results from the mutual interaction . . . of the four primary qualities residing within the elements."³³ The four elements—air, fire, earth, and water—combine in material bodies and are associated with the four primary qualities—the hot, cold, moist, and dry. Complexion, then, results from the interaction of these qualities, to produce composite bodies that are hot and dry (choleric), hot and moist (sanguineous), cold and moist (phlegmatic), cold and dry (melancholic), or, when the four qualities are equal, temperate or balanced. Although some would relegate the doctrine of complexion—so central to physiognomy—to the study of medicine,³⁴ nevertheless an understanding of its principles had a bearing on both speculative and practical theology.

³² See especially Walter Clyde Curry, *Chaucer and the Medieval Sciences* (New York, 1960), chaps. 3–4.

³³ Avicenna, *Canon* 1.1.3.1. I have used the translation found in *A Source Book in Medieval Science*, ed. Edward Grant (Cambridge, Mass., 1974), 717. This selection reprints portions from *A Treatise on the Canon of Medicine of Avicenna*, trans. O. Cameron Gruner (London, 1930), although the translation has been modified for Grant's volume by Michael McVaugh.

³⁴ Helinand of Froidment, *De cognitione sui* 8 (PL 212:729B): "Corporis humani cognitio in duabus est, in materia scilicet et forma. Complexionem autem medicis relinquo"

For practical theology, Alan of Lille (†1202/3) suggests that individuals may be more inclined to specific sins because of their humoral complexion. Thus, “the sinner’s complexion must be considered, insofar as it can be examined from external signs, because a person is more inclined to one sin than another according to various complexions. If he is a choleric he is more inclined to wrath, but if a melancholic he is more inclined to enmity.”³⁵ For this reason, it seems, Robert Grosseteste recommends that clerics should impose penance only after having given due consideration to complexion, since complexion has a bearing on an individual’s ability to withstand the inclination to sin.³⁶

Speculative theology turned to physiognomy and the doctrine of complexion in an altogether different way. Rather than arguing from outer to inner, from the appearance of the body to the condition of the soul, one may argue from the soul’s condition to the appearance of the body. William of Conches, for example, gives expression to a tradition that held that when still in Paradise, Adam’s complexion “was perfectly temperate, as he had equal shares of the four qualities.” As a result of his sin and disobedience, however, Adam’s descendants have departed from a perfectly balanced temperate complexion and the human body subsequently suffered corruption. After Adam was driven out of Eden, “his body began to dry out . . . [and] his natural heat to fade away. . . . His descendants, therefore, born as they were from a corrupt ancestor, have all been corrupted, and never afterward has perfect health been found in humans.”³⁷ Similarly, had Eve not sinned and remained in Paradise she would have remained hale, Hildegard of Bingen affirms, and avoided the woman’s “curse” or punishment—the monthly flux of blood, menstruation—which now is necessary to purge a woman’s body of impurities stemming from its corruption.³⁸

³⁵ “Complexio etiam peccatoris consideranda est, secundum quod ex signis exterioribus perpendi potest; quia secundum diversas complexiones, unus magis impellitur ad unum peccatum, quam aliis. Quia si cholericus magis impellitur ad iram, sed melancholicus magis ad odium” (Alain de Lille, *Liber poenitentialis* 1.17, ed. Jean Longère, *Analecta mediaevalia Namurcensia* 18, 2 vols. [Louvain, 1965], 2:31). Note that the edition in PL 210:287D adds, following this passage, “si sanguineus, vel phlegmaticus, ad luxuriam.”

³⁶ Robert Grosseteste, *Templum Dei* 19.9, ed. Joseph Goering and F. A. C. Mantello, *Toronto Medieval Latin Texts* (Toronto, 1984), 64: “Hec sunt diligenter consideranda in penitencia iniungenda. . . . Complexio: si colericus, uel sanguineus, uel melancholicus.”

³⁷ “Primus enim homo inter quatuor qualitates fuit temperatus. Sed postquam amoenitate paradisi expulsus . . . cepit desiccari atque naturalis calor extingui. . . . Omnes igitur ex eo nati, utpote ex corrupto, sunt corrupti, neque postea perfecta sanitas in homine fuit inuenta” (William of Conches, *Dragmaticon Philosophiae* 6.13.2–3, ed. Italo Ronca, CCCC 152 [Turnhout, 1997], 227). A translation appeared as *A Dialogue on Natural Philosophy (Dragmaticon Philosophiae)*, trans. Italo Ronca and Matthew Curr (Notre Dame, 1997), 147. See also Honorius of Autun, *De philosophia mundi* 23 (PL 172:55D).

³⁸ Hildegard of Bingen, *Causae et Curae* 3, ed. Paul Kaiser (Leipzig, 1903), 103.

God gave to humans the most noble, balanced complexion³⁹ and, in general terms, the ideal human complexion—given our seminal position between angelic and animal natures—should approach that of celestial bodies. Consequently, remarks Albert the Great, “man, among all creatures, more closely resembles a heavenly body owing to a balanced complexion participating less in contrary qualities—from which celestial bodies are altogether free. . . .”⁴⁰ Yet since Adam’s fall is responsible for bodily corruption among his descendants, it follows too that an ideal human complexion will be rediscovered only in those unburdened by original sin: namely, Mary and Jesus, for they alone, in this life, were “absolutely perfect.”⁴¹ The logic of this position rooted in physiognomy must have been reasonably compelling. Thomas Aquinas was acquainted with the argument that Jesus had to have displayed the best and most balanced human complexion both because his soul was most perfect and because his body was fashioned not in the normal way, but miraculously by the Holy Spirit.⁴² Similarly Albert the Great, following Plato, affirms that “the most noble soul is owed to the most balanced complexion” because each complexion receives a form proper to it,⁴³ and St. Bonaventure confirms that Jesus’s body displayed the best possible complexion.⁴⁴

³⁹ See Albert the Great, *Quaestiones super de animalibus* 6.24–26, ed. Filthaut, 168.25, where Albert attributes this view to Avicenna (see the *Canon* 1.1.6.3).

⁴⁰ “. . . homo inter omnia plus accedit ad similitudinem corporis caelestis, propter aequalitatem complexionis minus participans qualitates contrarias, a quibus corpora caelestia sunt omnino libera . . .” (*Super Dionysium de ecclesiastica hierarchia* 5, ed. Maria Burger, *Opera omnia* 36/2 [Münster, 1999], 123.2–7; see also *De animalibus* 12.1.4.55; *On Animals*, 914).

⁴¹ So, notes Albert, “nullus in hac vita perfectus fuit simpliciter nisi Iesus Christus et mater eius . . .” (*Super Dionysium de ecclesiastica hierarchia* 1, ed. Burger, 13.10–11).

⁴² “Christ had the best complexion, which clearly is owing to the fact that he had the most noble soul, to which a balanced complexion corresponds in the body” (“Christus fuit optime complexionatus: quod patet ex eo quod habuit nobilissimam animam, cui respondet aequalitas complexionis in corpore,” Thomas Aquinas, *In III Sent.* 15.2.3, ed. P. Mandonnet and M. F. Moos, *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum*, 4 vols. [Paris, 1929–47], 3:495). See also *Summa theologiae* 3.46.6c.: “with respect to the body he had the best complexion because his body was fashioned miraculously by the operation of the Holy Spirit” (“nam et secundum corpus erat optime complexionatus, cum corpus ejus fuerit formatum miraculose operatione Spiritus Sancti”). Albert the Great also indicates that because of Adam’s sin, his semen was corrupted and therefore among those who descend materially from his seed the operative or formative power of the semen fails to fashion a human in the condition Adam had known previously. See his *Super argumentum Hieronymi*, in *Super Matthaeum*, ed. B. Schmidt, *Opera omnia* 21/1 (Münster, 1987), 8.43–47. Jesus’ miraculous birth places him outside this material chain of descent.

⁴³ “Et quia secundum merita materiae dantur formae, sicut Plato dixit, et unicuique complexioni propria respondet forma, ideo aequaliori complexioni debetur anima nobilissima . . .” (Albert the Great, *De anima* 2.3.23, ed. Clemens Stroick, *Opera omnia* 7/1 [Münster, 1968], 133.22).

⁴⁴ “Ex parte enim carnis erat teneritudo naturae optime complexionatae; et quanto natura

Still, none of the examples cited above provide anything like an investigation into the physiognomy of Mary or Jesus. There is, however, such an investigation in a work improperly attributed to Albert the Great, entitled the *Mariale* or the *CCXXX quaestiones super Evangelium "Missus est."*⁴⁵ The authorship of this text remains much in doubt. Meersseman and initially Pelster were inclined to treat it as authentic—indeed, perhaps as Albert's earliest writing.⁴⁶ More recent studies by Fries, Korošak, Pelster and Kolping, however, have rejected Albert's authorship.⁴⁷ Along with the question of authorship, the date of the work remains in dispute, with suggestions ranging from 1240 to 1300. Nevertheless, studies of its literary influence⁴⁸ and manuscript transmission⁴⁹ indicate that it circulated and was copied fairly often.

The significance of this text for a discussion of physiognomy, it seems to me, is twofold: 1) perhaps for the first time it attempts to articulate fully the implications of the notion that the body of Mary (and Jesus as well) will reveal the best human complexion; 2) in doing so, it puts real flesh, so to speak, on Marian bones and refuses to treat Mary merely as a theological symbol and a counterweight to Eve. Mary becomes a historical person, for whom the science of physiognomy can provide a suitable visage.⁵⁰

tenerior, tanto eius poena dolorosior" (Bonaventure, *Sermones dominicales* 14.12, ed. J. G. Bougerol [Grottaferrata, 1977], 231).

⁴⁵ The text is found in Albert's *Opera omnia*, ed. Borgnet, 37:1–362.

⁴⁶ See Franz Pelster, *Kritische Studien zum Leben und zu den Schriften Alberts des Grossen* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1920), 109–12; and Meersseman, *Introductio in opera omnia B. Alberti Magni O.P.*, 119–20.

⁴⁷ See Albert Fries, *Die unter dem Namen des Albertus Magnus überlieferten Mariologischen Schriften. Literarkritische Untersuchung*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters 37/4 (Münster, 1954), 5–80; Bruno Korošak, *Mariologia S. Alberti Magni eiusque coaequalium*. Bibliotheca Mariana Medii Aevi, Textus et Disquisitiones 8 (Rome, 1954), 3–18; and Franz Pelster, "Zwei Untersuchungen über die literarischen Grundlagen für die Darstellung einer Mariologie des hl. Alberts des Großen," *Scholastik* 30 (1955): 388–402. Their arguments are reviewed by A. Kolping, "Zur Frage des Textgeschichte, Herkunft und Entstehungszeit der anonymen *Laus Virginis* (bisher *Mariale* Alberts des Großen)," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 25 (1958): 285–328. No one has as yet identified a probable author, and these scholars also disagree on the likely date for the work, situating it between about 1240 and 1300.

⁴⁸ Johannes Beumer, "Die literarischen Beziehungen zwischen dem Sermo VI De Assumptione BMV (Pseudo-Bonaventura) und dem *Mariale* oder *Laus Virginis* (Pseudo-Albertus)," *Franziskanischen Studien* 44 (1962): 455–60.

⁴⁹ See Kolping, "Zur Frage des Textgeschichte, Herkunft und Entstehungszeit," 288–305.

⁵⁰ Despite the opinion of Augustine, that we simply do not know what Mary looked like: "Neque enim nouimus faciem virginis Mariae, ex qua ille a uiro intacta neque in ipso partu corrupta mirabiliter natus est" (*De trinitate* 8.5.7, ed. W. J. Mountain and Fr. Glorie, CCL 50 [Turnhout, 1968], 277).

In *quaestiones* 17–20 in particular the author puts on display his knowledge of physiognomy and attempts to reconcile discordant medical authorities—especially Galen and Constantine the African—whose conflicting testimony would lead to quite different portraits of the Virgin and her Son. Following Galen, the physiognomist will conclude that Mary (and, by inference, Jesus) had red hair, since red hair is appropriate to a body whose humoral complexion is well balanced;⁵¹ following Constantine the African, one must conclude that it was black.⁵² Following Aristotle, one would conclude that the Virgin's skin had to be white, since among colors the simple extremes—white and black—are most perfect and, since whiteness reflects the causal efficacy of light better than blackness, a white body will be more perfect than black.⁵³ Some conclude that her skin should be ruddy in color, since this reflects a sanguine complexion,⁵⁴ while others imply that her skin should be black to reflect her nature—which ought to be warm,⁵⁵ since it is a warm nature that will best highlight, by contrast, her chastity⁵⁶ and the fullness of grace in her.

⁵¹ Galen remarks, “Si eucraton cerebrum existit secundum quattuor qualitates . . . talibus infantibus quidem existentibus fiunt capilli subruffi; pueris vero subrubei: perfectis vero sunt rubei medii quodammodo existentes crisporum et simplicium, neque calvi fiunt facilius” (*Microtegni* II, fol. 12ra, in *Opera Galeni*, ed. Diomedes Bonardus [Venice: P. Pincius, 1490]). The Latin translation is by Constantine the African. My thanks to Luke Demaitre for locating this and other passages attributed to Galen.

⁵² “Ergo ad eucraticum corpus pertinet nigredo in capillis secundum Constantinium. Et sic etiam videtur controversia inter Constantinium et Galenum: cum hic nigrum capillorum colorem ponat in aequali corpore, ille autem rubeum” (Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 19.2.2, ed. Borgnet, 43–44). Constantine does suggest that the human body having the best complexion (warm and moist) will produce straight, black hair and a ruddy or pinkish skin color: “Si corpus est humidum erit pingue et carneum. . . . Si calidum et humidum fuerit, nimie est carnis parve pinguedinis. Pili nigri atque plani. tactus calidus et humidus. color albi et rufi medius” (*L'Arte universale della medicina (Pantegni). Parte 1—Libro I*, trans. Marco T. Malato and Umberto de Martini [Rome, 1961], chap. 17, p. 65). For the importance and influence of the *Pantegni*, see n. 62 below.

⁵³ “. . . sed dicit Philosophus, quod extrema sunt magis sensitiva et motiva: ergo albedo et nigredo quae sunt extreimi colores, magis perfecti sunt in ratione colorum: ergo alter eorum erit in corpore perfectissimo . . . in perfecto corpore potius erit effectus lucis quam tenebrarum: hic autem est albedo: ergo corpus perfectissimum potius erit album quam nigrum” (Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 18.3, ed. Borgnet, 41).

⁵⁴ “Videtur potius, quod debuit fuisse rubeum: corpus enim eucraticum est maxime sanguineae complexionis: ergo corpus optime complexionatum debuit esse rubeum” (*ibid.* 18.5[a], ed. Borgnet, 41).

⁵⁵ “Quaeritur de colore cutis et venustate. . . . Et videtur, quod debuit esse nigra in cute. . . . Quod non albedo, patet: quia albedo est color corporis in quo est abundantia frigiditatis . . .” (*ibid.* 18 and 18.2, ed. Borgnet, 41).

⁵⁶ “Item Philosophus [dicit] . . . medium virtutis est pati nec deduci: ergo virtuosior est castitas, ubi major passio a contrario: hoc autem est in calidis: ergo, etc.” (*ibid.* 18.11, ed. Borgnet, 43).

For a determination regarding her eyes, our author notes that some have argued that when the hair is black, typically the eye and hair color agree. Others indicate that the most beautiful eyes will have color (i.e., blue, or grey, etc.) while black eyes, as Johannitius says, follow from a defect in the visible spirit or a paucity of the crystalline humor in the eye.⁵⁷

Ultimately, however, for Ps.-Albert it is the brain's complexion that must determine the Virgin's eye and hair color, since "we say that the hair color indicates the immediate disposition of the brain [*cerebrum*]. For this reason, the best hair color should be determined by the best complexion of the brain."⁵⁸ The brain's "best" complexion, however, can be determined in two ways: either as it is ordered to the natural power or faculty [*virtus*], that is to the power intrinsic to the principal members—heart, liver, and stomach, etc.—to perform their specific operations; or, as it is ordered to the animal virtue or faculty. In the first instance, when ordered to the natural faculty, the best-complexioned brain will be warm and moist and will, therefore, be indicated by the appropriate hair color (reddish yellow for infants; light blond for adolescents; and gold or flaxen for adults).⁵⁹ In the second, when ordered to the animal faculty which, in conjunction with the animal spirit, is essential to the process of cognition, the brain will be hot and dry because this is the complexion best suited to cognition.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ Ibid. 20.1, ed. Borgnet, 44–45. Johannitius is the Latin name given to Ḥunayn ibn Ishaq al-Ṭbādī (809?–873), a Nestorian Christian physician to the caliph al-Mutawakkil and translator of numerous Greek medical works into Arabic. An abridged version of his *Quaestiones medicinae* was translated by Constantine the African and circulated under the title *Isagoge*, becoming a part of the *Articella*, or medical curriculum, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. *The Book of the Ten Treatises on the Eye* (*Kitāb al-‘ashr Makalat fi’ l-‘ain*) is also attributed to him. On the *Isagoge* and its manuscript tradition, see Francis Newton, "Constantine the African and Monte Cassino: New Elements and the Text of the *Isagoge*," in *Constantine the African and ‘Alī ibn al-‘Abbās al-Maġūsī. The Pantegni and Related Texts*, ed. Charles Burnett and Danielle Jacquart (Leiden, 1994), 16–43. For an English translation, drawn from John Gaddesden's *Rosa Medicinae*, see *Source Book in Medieval Science*, ed. Grant, 705–15.

⁵⁸ "Dicimus quod color in capillis immediatam signat dispositionem cerebri. Unde optimus color in capillis, debet determinari secundum optimam cerebri complexionem" (Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 20.3, ed. Borgnet, 46).

⁵⁹ "Optima autem cerebri complexio determinatur secundum duos modos. Uno modo est cerebrum optime complexionatum, quando est optime ordinatum ad actionem naturalis virtutis, ita quod operationes cerebri maxime ordinantur secundum qualitates ad operationes cordis, et hepatis, et stomachi, et aliorum membrorum principalium. Et secundum hoc cerebrum debet esse calidum et humidum. Et hoc modo capilli talis cerebri in infantibus sunt subfulvi, in pueris vero subflavi, in perfectis vero flavi . . ." (ibid. 20.3, ed. Borgnet, 46). Albert identifies four functions specific to the natural *virtus*: attraction, digestion, retention, and expulsion (ibid. 12.5, ed. Borgnet, 227). Note, however, that Albert recognizes only three principal members: the brain, heart, and liver; see *De animalibus* 1.1.5.73 (*On Animals*, 72).

⁶⁰ "Alio modo dicitur *eucraticum* cerebrum, secundum quod est optime dispositum et ordi-

This allusion to the natural and animal faculties draws upon the well established medical tradition of the three spirits and their corresponding faculties or *virtutes*: the natural, the vital or spiritual, and the animal.⁶¹ For Constantine the African, the natural spirit arises in the liver and travels through the veins to administer the natural faculty, regulating the functions of the principal members of the body; a vital spirit arises in the heart and travels through the arteries to administer the vital faculty; the animal spirit arises in the ventricles of the brain, travels through the nerves, and administers the animal faculty, regulating various functions of the soul. Charles Burnett has noted that for both Constantine the African's *Pantegni* and his principal Arabic source, the animal spirit is a decocted product of the heart's vital spirit, purified in the arteries that form a mesh at the base of the brain.

This newly-formed animal spirit then proceeds up two further arteries into the forepart of the brain where it is purified once again and the waste products are ejected through the palate and the nostrils. From here the spirit may pass to the middle and back part of the brain. . . . In the back part of the brain the spirit causes memory, in the front part sense and "fantasia," in the middle part intellect or reason.⁶²

natum ad actiones virtutis animalis, quae proprie fiunt in cerebro mediante spiritu animali qui nascitur in cerebro. Et secundum hoc calidum et siccum debet esse cerebrum, quia illae duae qualitates maxime subserviunt cognitioni . . ." (*Mariale* 20, 3, ed. Borgnet, 46). As Albert indicates elsewhere, the animal powers and spirit are so called because they pertain to the activities of the mind or soul [*anima*]. Thus, one finds the animal powers located in the brain; see *De animalibus* 1.2.26.486 and 499 (*On Animals*, 232 and 237), and *Super Dionysium de ecclesiastica hierarchia* 2 (ed. Burger, 35.42). See also William of Conches, for whom the anterior cell of the brain, to which vision communicates images or phantasms of sensible objects, is best complexioned when it is hot and dry "so that by means of dry heat, whose property is to attract, it may draw to itself the shapes and colors of the external objects." By contrast, the rear cell of the brain—in which memory operates to retain images of past experience—should be cold and dry "for it is the property of something cold and dry to constrict and retain" (*Dragmaticon* 6.18.4–5, trans. Ronca and Curr, 155).

⁶¹ William of Conches identifies the three *virtutes* as *naturalis*, *spiritualis*, and *animalis*. See his *Dragmaticon* 6.12.1.

⁶² Charles Burnett, "The Chapter on the Spirits in the *Pantegni* of Constantine the African," in *Constantine the African and 'Alī ibn al-'Abbās al Mağusi. The Pantegni and Related Texts*, ed. Burnett and Jacquot, 105. The *Pantegni* is Constantine's translation of the *Liber regius* of Haly Abbas ('Alī ibn al-'Abbās al Mağusi †994), which became an important medical reference work in the Middle Ages. For its influence, distribution, and complicated manuscript history, see in the same volume Mark Jordan, "The Fortune of Constantine's *Pantegni*," 287–302 (and especially p. 302 for his appeal to establish an edition), and also Italo Ronca, "The Influence of the *Pantegni* on William of Conches's *Dragmaticon*," 266–85. For a further discussion of doctrines of the spirits, see James J. Bono, "Medical Spirits and the Medieval Language of Life," *Traditio* 40 (1984): 91–130.

Similarly, Albert the Great affirms that “the vital spirits are generated in the heart and flow through the arteries to the brain and there, owing to the coldness of the brain . . . these become animal spirits. And then these [animal spirits] are dispatched to the particular senses. . . .”⁶³ It is then the animal spirit’s corresponding *virtus*, the animal faculty, that is linked to the act of cognition and the operations of the intellect.⁶⁴

For the author of the *Mariale*, like William of Conches and Michael Scot (for whom a warm and dry complexion in the brain indicates a person of quick wit and intelligence),⁶⁵ the brain’s complexion that best accommodates the animal faculty and therefore is best suited to the process of cognition and apprehension will be warm and dry. He declares,

Since the well-balanced brain is best ordered in one respect to the actions of the animal virtue and in another respect to the operation of the natural virtue, and the operation of the animal virtue will be more noble than the operation of the natural virtue, that brain which is properly well-balanced toward the animal operations will be more noble than that oriented toward the natural operations. Therefore a brain of the most perfect and noble body ought to be warm and dry. Since then the body of our Lady will have been the most perfect with respect to all her members, she had a warm and dry brain. . . .⁶⁶

The complexion of Mary’s brain may distinguish her from most other women, since for Albert the Great,

a woman is less suited to good customs than is a male. For a female’s complexion is more moist than a male’s, but it belongs to a moist complexion to

⁶³ “Spiritus enim vitales generantur in corde et fluunt per arterias usque ad cerebrum et ibi per frigiditatem cerebri . . . fiunt illi spiritus animales. Et deinde mittuntur usque ad sensus particulares . . .” (Albert the Great, *Quaestiones super de animalibus* 12.17, ed. Filthaut, 235). For Albert, the brain must be cold relative to the heart to temper the heart’s dynamic heat: “Quod probatur, quia cerebrum hominis est magis frigidum et humidum, et hoc, ut obtemperet calorem cordis . . .” (ibid. 1.34–37, ed. Filthaut, 101.33–34). When its coldness causes the condensation of the moist vapors rising to the brain, this condensation blocks the operation of the animal virtues and brings on sleep (ibid. 4.11, ed. Filthaut, 146.23–28).

⁶⁴ Note too a similar tripartite division of the spirits in Albert’s *De animalibus* 20.1.7.41 (*On Animals*, 1381). The description Burnett provides of the ascent of the animal spirit to the brain is repeated by William of Conches, *Dragmaticon* 6.16.1.

⁶⁵ Michael Scot, *Liber phisionomiae* 32.

⁶⁶ “Cum igitur cerebrum eucraticum optime sit ordinatum, uno modo ad actiones virtutis animalis, alio modo respectu operationum virtutis naturalis, et nobilior sit operatio virtutis animalis, quam naturalis virtutis, nobilis erit cerebrum quod est eucraticum ad operationes animales quam ad operationes naturales; ergo perfectissimi et nobilissimi corporis cerebrum debet esse calidum et siccum. Cum igitur corpus Dominae nostrae fuerit perfectissimum secundum omnia membra, ipsa habuit cerebrum calidum et siccum . . .” (Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 20.3, ed. Borgnet, 47).

receive [impressions] easily but to retain them poorly. For moisture is easily changeable (*mobile*) and this is why women are inconstant and always seeking after something new. . . . Therefore there is no faithfulness in a woman.⁶⁷

The conclusion that “there is no faithfulness in a woman” is particularly inappropriate for Mary’s character and one should not be surprised, then, that Mary’s complexion will depart in many ways from the norm among women. Therefore, for Ps.-Albert the Virgin’s complexion tends toward warmth, although (as will become evident below) not for the reason some avow, namely that chastity exists naturally in a cold complexion and therefore manifests itself most clearly—by way of contrast—in a warm complexion.⁶⁸ Rather, it seems, it is because our author hopes to disassociate Mary from some, but not all, of the consequences stemming from a woman’s typical complexion, which generally was understood to be phlegmatic and therefore “colder” and “moister” in nature than a man’s.⁶⁹ From the standpoint of physiology, this complexional coldness acts to diminish the brain’s cognitive abilities. The coldness governing their post-lapsarian nature also makes women unable to complete the digestion of blood, resulting in the necessity to purge the body of its coarse and undigested blood via menstruation. Men, naturally “hotter,”⁷⁰ fully perfect the digestive process, thereby obviating the need for menstrua-

⁶⁷ “. . . femina minus est habilis ad mores quam mas. Complexio enim feminae magis est humida quam maris, sed humili est de facili recipere et male retinere. Humidum est enim de facili mobile, et ideo mulieres sunt inconstantes et nova semper petentes. . . . Unde nulla fides est in muliere” (Albert the Great, *Quaestiones super de animalibus* 15.11, ed. Filthaut, 265.69–74).

⁶⁸ For the claim that chastity naturally demands a cold complexion, suggesting therefore that the Virgin must have had a very cold complexion, see *Mariale* 18.6–8; for the arguments to the contrary, see q. 18.9–11. However, at q. 20.3 (p. 45), Ps.-Albert responds that since the Virgin’s chastity is a product of grace and not nature, her complexion must be understood to be warm, and not cold (see n. 75 below). The argument that chastity is more natural in a cold complexion, whereas sexual desire arises from a warmer nature, will be found too in Michael Scot’s *Liber phisionomiae* 4–5 (27). Ps.-Albert’s response suggests an important caveat for the theological application of the science of physiognomy: such a science leads to certainty only with respect to nature, and not nature ennobled by grace. Earlier in the thirteenth century Roger Bacon had made the same point: “multum debet esse prudens et expertus qui de his debet judicare, nec de Christianis debet aliquis judicare nisi aptitudinem naturalem ad mores, non quod talis erit, quia gratia Dei gratum faciens potest vincere malam dispositionem animi ad quam excitatur ex complexione et compositione corporis . . .” (*Secretum secretorum*, pars 4, c. 2, ed. Robert Steele, *Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi*, fasc. 5 [Oxford, 1920], 166 n.3, 125b).

⁶⁹ William of Conches, *Dragmaticon* 6.8.3; Albert the Great, *De animalibus* 10.1.1.11, 10.1.2.20, and 18.2.5.78 (*On Animals*, 831, 835, and 1319).

⁷⁰ See Albert the Great, *Quaestiones super de animalibus* 5.10, ed. Filthaut, 159.75–77: “universaliter vir calidioris complexionis est quam mulier. . . .” See also Constantine the African: “In omnibus animalibus calidores et sicciores sunt masculi quam feminine, feminine frigidiores et humidiores” (*L’Arte universale della medicina (Pantegni)*, chap. 22, p. 69).

tion, which was perceived to be a special “curse” or punishment visited upon the daughters of Eve.⁷¹ Physiology cannot be separated from a consideration of the passions, however. When in a woman these bodily superfluities are not adequately purged by menstruation, or when they are retained during pregnancy, this often results in a ‘warming’ accompanied by inordinate sexual desire.⁷² Typically, Danielle Jacquart notes, this relatively warmer female complexion was associated with the courtesan or prostitute (suggesting again a relationship between chastity and a cold complexion).⁷³

Despite numerous arguments, then, to suggest that by nature alone or from a combination of nature and grace the Virgin’s complexion should be cold, our text concludes that this is not so. But, this conclusion does not follow from the principle articulated at *Mariale* 18.10, that the glory of victory is greater in proportion to victory’s difficulty (“ubi autem est difficilior victoria, major gloria”), suggesting, then, that her victory over the passions will be made more evident if she possesses by nature a temperately warm complexion (slightly “hot-blooded,” if you will, relative to other women).⁷⁴ Our author does not accept the premise that Mary’s chastity stems from a colder complexion; rather, in her chastity is wholly a product of grace. According to Ps.-Albert, despite the warmth of her nature Mary, full of grace, never experienced concupiscence or desire; in her even the traces of sin [*fomes*] had been extinguished.⁷⁵ In Mary there was no real conflict between her passions and her complexional nature; she was miraculously without the inclination to sin—to sexual intercourse—often associated with women having a warmer complexion. The example of her chastity even banished concupiscence from the hearts of others—perhaps recalling a claim found in Jacobus de Voragine’s *Golden Legend* that “despite Mary’s exceeding beauty no man

⁷¹ Charles T. Wood has shown that thirteenth-century theologians—especially defenders of the Immaculate Conception—were sometimes led to a dilemma, brought on by a desire to free Mary of the “curse” of menstruation, while acknowledging that she *must* have menstruated if she were to provide the appropriate material for the birth of the God-Man; see his “The Doctor’s Dilemma: Sin, Salvation, and the Menstrual Cycle in Medieval Thought,” *Speculum* 56 (1981): 710–27.

⁷² William of Conches, *Dragmaticon* 6.9.2; Albert the Great, *De animalibus* 18.2.4.72 (*On Animals*, 1316).

⁷³ See Danielle Jacquart, “La morphologie du corps féminin selon les médecins de la fin du moyen âge,” *Micrologus 1: I discorsi dei corpi*, 83.

⁷⁴ Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 18.7–9.

⁷⁵ “Quod autem objicitur, quod debuit esse frigidae complexionis et habere colorem illi attestantem. Dicimus, quod non: cum enim gratia nobilior sit quam natura, castitas quae est totaliter a gratia, nobilior est quam ea quae est partim a gratia et partim a natura. Et tanto est major gratia et majorem potentiam demonstrat, quanto fortior est vincit naturam, quamvis in beata Virgine nulla fuit pugna, quia etiam fomes extinctus fuit in ea” (*ibid.* 20.3, ed. Borgnet, 45).

could ever desire her, for the reason that the power of her chastity penetrated all who looked upon her, and all lustful desires were quenched in them.”⁷⁶

Instead, it seems that Mary’s complexion must be somewhat warmer, relative to other women, not in order better to display a victory over the passions but rather to return her complexion to the balance appropriate to the species. Were she to display the phlegmatic complexion shared generally by other women, she would depart from the overall ideal of a hot and moist complexion, best illustrated in males, and remain, as a consequent, a defective or flawed male (*mas occasionatus*).⁷⁷ I emphasize “relative to other women,” since complexion can be examined according to various measures. In his *Quaestiones super de animalibus*, Albert the Great notes,

Complexion can be considered three ways: either according to genus (and thus every living thing is said to be hot and moist, because on account of these life endures); or, in a second way, according to species, and thus a human is said to be hot and moist but the ass is hot and dry, and likewise so is the lion. In a third way, according to the individual, and this can be considered in two ways: either comparatively or absolutely. Comparatively, just as one woman is said to be choleric in comparison with another, although nevertheless all women are naturally phlegmatic. If absolutely, then this person is said to be choleric and that one sanguine.⁷⁸

Consequently, although in general women are phlegmatic (that is, cold and moist), Mary’s complexion seems to tend toward balance and therefore will be comparatively warmer than that of other women. As already discussed, in order to perform its more noble operations, her brain must be warm and dry. Balance reveals itself in the *qualitas* of her body as well. Generally, Ps.-Albert notes, bodies may be divided into five types: the exceedingly fat, the

⁷⁶ Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend*, trans. William Ryan, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1993), 1:149.

⁷⁷ For woman as a *mas occasionatus*, see Albert the Great, *De animalibus* 3.2.8.158 and 16.1.14.73 (*On Animals*, 422 and 1195), and *Quaestiones super de animalibus* 15.11 (ed. Filthaut, 265.81–82). For discussion of this notion in Albert’s work, see Paul Hossfeld, *Albertus Magnus über die Frau* (Bad Honnef, 1982), reprinted in *Trierer theologische Zeitschrift* 91 (1982): 221–40; and Madeleine Jeay, “Albert le Grand entre Aristote et Freud: La Femme est-elle un acte manqué?” in *Le Racisme: Mythes et sciences: Pour Leon Poliakov*, ed. Maurice Olender (Brussels, 1981), 129–39.

⁷⁸ “Complexio tripliciter potest se habere: aut secundum genus, et sic omne vivens dicitur calidum et humidum, quia per ista stat vita. Alio modo secundum speciem, et sic dicitur homo calidus et humidus et asinus calidus et siccus et leo similiter. Tertio modo secundum individuum, et hoc dupliciter: aut respective aut absolute. Respective, sicut una mulier dicitur cholérica respectu alterius, cum tamen omnes naturaliter phlegmaticae. Si absolute, sic dicitur iste homo cholericus et ille sanguineus” (Albert the Great, *Quaestiones super de animalibus* 4.1–2, ed. Filthaut, 138.52–61).

fleshy, the thin, a mixture of these (*synthesis*), or the balanced. In the Virgin Mary, however, one finds the last type, resulting from a complexional balance of the humors.⁷⁹ Her skin color provides additional evidence of a balanced or temperate complexion. Of six possible skin colors (a white-red composite, black, citrine, grey, white, and red),

only that one that is a mixture of white and red, as Johannitius says, proceeds from balance.⁸⁰ All of the others occur from inequality. The first [the white-red composite] is that which is most noble and best determined to the well-balanced body, and thus is placed by Galen⁸¹ in a temperate complexion and is treated in a similar way by Constantine in the *Pantechne*.⁸² For this reason, we concede that it existed in the body of the blessed Virgin.⁸³

This leads to certain conclusions, as well, regarding hair and eye color. According to Constantine the African⁸⁴ and Michael Scot,⁸⁵ black, curly hair is another sign of a drier and warmer complexion in the brain. Our author concludes: "thus it is clear . . . that the best complexion of the brain, as far as concerns the animal virtues, is one that is warm and dry. And black hair seems to belong to such a brain. And this is what Constantine says in the *Pantechne*, mentioned above."⁸⁶ Since Mary had a warm and dry brain and in

⁷⁹ "Quod concedimus et credimus esse verum, idem de qualitate dicentes: modi enim qualitatis corporis sunt quinque, crassities nimia, carnositas, extenuata macies, synthesis, et aequalitas. Pinguedo causatur ex frigiditate et humiditate, carnositas ex caliditate et humiditate, extenuata macies ex caliditate et siccitate, synthesis ex frigiditate et siccitate, aequalitas ex omnium humorum aequali complexione, cuius aequalitas credimus corpus beatissimae Virginis existisse" (Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 17.2, ed. Borgnet, 40).

⁸⁰ See Johannitius's comments in the *Isagoge*, translated in *Source Book in Medieval Science*, ed. Grant, 707. Michael Scot agrees. See his *Liber phisionomiae* 24.

⁸¹ "Signa competentis craseos secundum totam habitudinem animalis [virtutis]: color quidem ex rubeo et albo commixtus, capilli vero et rubei et medicriter crisi" (Galen, *Micro-tegni*, II, fol. 13ra).

⁸² Constantine remarks, "Si totum corpus fuerit temperatum inter album et rufum, inter humidum et calidum, tempora[m]en]tum significat. Si ruffum et croceum. calorem nimium. Si tantum album frigiditatem" (*L'Arte universale della medicina (Pantegni)*, chap. 13, p. 60).

⁸³ "Et solus ille qui est ex rubore et albedine compositus, ut dicit Johannicius, est ab aequalitate procedens; alii vero omnes ab inaequalitate. Primus est nobilissimus et corpori eucratico determinatus, et sic a Galeno in temperata complexione positus est, et simili modo a Constantino in *Pantechne*. Hunc igitur concedimus in corpore beatissimae Virginis existisse" (Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 20.2, ed. Borgnet, 45).

⁸⁴ "Pili cito nascentes. et se in altum surgentes. ostendunt cerebri siccitatem. Si nimis crisi. nigri et multi. et cito decalvandi. calorem significant. et siccitatem" (*L'Arte universale della medicina (Pantegni)*, chap. 10, p. 56).

⁸⁵ Michael Scot, *Liber phisionomiae* 32.

⁸⁶ "Et sic patet . . . quod optima complexio cerebri quantum ad virtutes animales est calidum et siccum. Et cerebro sic se habenti debentur capilli nigri. Et hoc est quod dicit Constantinus in *Pantechne* in superioribus" (Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 20.3, ed. Borgnet, 47). Cf. Michael

every respect the most balanced or perfect complexion, Ps.-Albert insists she must have had black hair.⁸⁷ Red (or blonde) hair, which Galen identifies as a sign of a sanguineous and therefore noble complexion, our author dismisses. Indeed, by the later Middle Ages red hair had become identified with a number of vices. For Michael Scot, red hair signifies a person who is envious, venal, duplicitous, proud, and ill-speaking.⁸⁸ Increasingly, red hair was employed in Christian iconography to depict the enemies of Christ—Jews in general, and Judas in particular.⁸⁹ Black hair, Ps.-Albert affirms, is a sign of a healthy body that has successfully purged itself of the most noxious humors which, in any event, were absent from Virgin Mary's body. In this instance, the Song of Songs, which describes the beloved as having a "head of finest gold" but "hairs . . . black as a raven" (Song of Songs 5:11) is understood not allegorically—as was so common—but quite literally, and therefore lends support to the conclusions of physiognomy. Further evidence is drawn from the testimony of the veil of Veronica,⁹⁰ which identifies Jesus as having had black hair and beard. The author of our text assumes a similarity between mother and Son, such that from the Son's hair color one can infer the color of the mother's hair.

Similarly, with respect to the color of the Virgin's eyes, our text concludes that "the color in the eyes should immediately indicate the complexion of their own subject, and the [Virgin's] brain having already been determined without any doubt to be warm and dry, the color of the eyes will be determined to be black."⁹¹ Although Johannitius insisted that black eyes stemmed

Scot's characterization of a warm and dry complexion in the brain: "If the brain is of a warm and dry complexion, the hairs grow out to be very blond and short or black or curly; this person is especially wanton; for this reason his hair will quickly grey and grow bald; he sleeps but little at night; he is of great wit, quick to understand and apprehend" ("Si cerebrum fuerit calidæ et siccae complexionis capilli nascuntur flavi fortes et curti vel nigri vel crissipi; homo est multum luxuriosus, et ideo cito canescit et calvescit; parum dormit in nocte et est magnum ingenii et repentina intellectus et apprehensionis," *Liber phisionomiae* 32).

⁸⁷ "Cum igitur corpus Dominae nostræ fuerit perfectissimum secundum omnia membra, ipsa habuit cerebrum calidum et siccum et capillos nigros" (Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 20.3, ed. Borgnet, 46).

⁸⁸ Ps.-Albert, *Liber phisionomiae* 59.

⁸⁹ See Ruth Mellinkoff, *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (Berkeley, 1993), 1:150–59; and Claudine Fabre-Vassas, *The Singular Beast: Jews, Christians, and the Pig*, trans. Carol Volk (New York, 1997), 107–11.

⁹⁰ Albert acknowledges that Jesus left a facial impression on Veronica's veil also at *In Evangelium Lucae* 8:44 (ed. Borgnet, 583).

⁹¹ "Dicimus, quod color in oculis cum immediate significet complexionem proprii subjecti, procul dubio cerebro et calido et sicco determinato, determinabitur color oculorum niger" (Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 20.3, ed. Borgnet, 47). Compare what immediately follows with Albert's contention, expressed in *De animalibus* 19.3.12 (*On Animals*, 1338), that black eyes result from an

from a deficiency in the crystalline humor, our author remarks that though the paucity of the humor is the cause of the black color in the eye, it is not a deficiency. Rather, it reflects the fact that a noble brain—warm and dry—requires only a purer and more subtle nutriment, and therefore does not need more of the crystalline humor to sustain the eyes' vision. In conclusion, then, “the blessed Virgin had a mixture of white and red in the color of her skin; her hair and eyes, however, were moderately [*temperate*] black just as we believe that her beloved Son was more handsomely colored with respect to [his] form than all the sons of men.”⁹²

What is perhaps most surprising in the text by Ps.-Albert, however, is one last argument, viz. that “with respect to their innate complexion, offspring are accustomed to be like their parents, and vice versa. But we see that in many cases the race of Jews has black hair. Therefore, also our Lady, since she was the progeny of Jews.”⁹³ Although Ps.-Albert accepts the premise that offspring and their parents generally resemble one another,⁹⁴ he does not clearly endorse this argument. Nevertheless, the argument remains a little surprising for two reasons: first, because it clearly acknowledges the presence of a stereotypical Jewish physiognomy;⁹⁵ and, second, because so often Christian art of the later Middle Ages attempts to dejudaize Mary and Jesus, sharply distinguishing their appearance from the darker, more ominous (even Satanic) appearance of Jews,⁹⁶ despite a recognition that Mary's Jewishness—indeed that she too, and not only Joseph, was of Davidic descent!⁹⁷—was necessary

abundance of the watery or aqueous humor in the eye, and as a result they suffer from a sort of night blindness.

⁹² “Et sic beata Virgo in colore cutis fuit alba et rubea mixtim; in capillis autem et in oculis nigra temperate fuit, sicut et ejus Filium dilectum speciosissimum forma prae filiis hominum credimus fuisse coloratum” (Ps.-Albert, *Mariale* 20.3, ed. Borgnet, 47).

⁹³ “Secundum complexionem innatam soboles solent assimilari parentibus, et e contra; sed videmus, quod genus Judaeorum ut in pluribus habet nigros capillos; ergo et Domina nostra cum fuit de progenie Judaeorum” (ibid. 19.2.5, ed. Borgnet, 44).

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, q. 17.

⁹⁵ This is something which Sara Lipton claims is still absent from the *Bible moralisée*, made for the king of France between 1220 and 1229. See *Images of Intolerance: The Representation of Jews and Judaism in the “Bible moralisée”* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1999), 20–21.

⁹⁶ In addition to Ruth Mellinkoff, *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages*, see also Heinz Schreckenberg's *The Jew in Christian Art* (New York, 1996). Schreckenberg remarks that “the anti-Jewish thought-patterns behind Christian pictorial art [of the Middle Ages] . . . could no longer see the Jews as ‘older brothers’ and even suppressed the Jewishness of Jesus of Nazareth and his mother” (14). The dark-complexioned anti-Jewish stereotype was certainly known to Jews themselves in the thirteenth century, and is found in a thirteenth-century text of anti-Christian polemics compiled by Franco-German Jews; see David Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages. A Critical Edition of the Nizzahon Vetus* (Philadelphia, 1979), 224 and 340.

⁹⁷ So, as Ramon Llull stated, “our Lady [Mary] was of the house of David, who was the

in order to provide a foundation for Christian messianic claims. Even if Ps.-Albert the Great agrees that Jesus and Mary share a Jewish physiognomy he may have understood his Jewish *contemporaries* to have departed from this physiognomic ideal, just as they presented an image of gradual spiritual decline from the days of the patriarchs and prophets, through the Pharisees, to the thirteenth century.

III. CONCLUSION

It is clear that the growing attention given to physiognomy in scholastic scientific or philosophical texts had some interesting consequences for theologians. Practical theology required some consideration of an individual's complexion in assigning an appropriate penance, inasmuch as one's complexion might predispose an individual to specific sins. Speculative theology, however, like Ps.-Albert the Great's *Mariale*, reasoned from a "scientific" account of the most perfectly complexioned human body to reach seemingly legitimate inferences regarding the appearance of Jesus and his mother, Mary. In one sense, these inferences were not empirically grounded⁹⁸ but were based on the doctrines of medical and philosophical authorities, *viz.* Aristotle, Galen, and Constantine the African. Although Ps.-Albert the Great's text did appeal in passing to an iconographic tradition based on accounts of Veronica's veil, this seems almost an afterthought. More important was the attempt to reconcile discordant authorities to deduce Mary's color of hair, eyes, and skin, and to bring this depiction into agreement with some elementary ethnographic claims. In the process, Mary (and, by inference, Jesus) are clothed with physical characteristics meant to withstand the scrutiny of the medieval scientific community.

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

noblest and most honored king the Jews ever had . . ." (*Book of the Gentiles* 3.9.6, ed. and trans. Anthony Bonner in *Doctor Illuminatus: A Ramon Llull Reader* [Princeton, 1985], 137).

⁹⁸ For example, our author does not ask the color of Mary's hair which several religious houses or churches allege to have been deposited in holy relics or phylacteries in their possession. Cf. Herman of Tournai, *De miraculis B. Mariae Laudunensis libri tres* 2.4 (PL 156:976C); and *Scriptores ordinis Grandimontensis: Epistula Guigonis de Blauone de reliquiis terrae sanctae*, ed. J. Becquet, CCCM 8 (Turnhout, 1968), 215.24–28.

TRUE PRESENCE/ FALSE CHRIST: THE ANTONOMIES OF EMBODIMENT IN MEDIEVAL SPIRITUALITY

Dyan Elliott

THE religious life of the high and later Middle Ages was both agitated and sustained by repeated sightings of the body of Christ. The font of such experiences was the sacrament of the altar—the eucharistic miracle whereby the mere words of the priest transformed bread and wine into the actual body and blood of Christ. Directly dependent on this sacrament were the ritualized sightings that were contrived for reverent onlookers: the elevation of the host in the course of Mass, the reservation of the host, or the display of the host during processions, particularly attendant on the feast of Corpus Christi. The Eucharist was also the source for still more flamboyant wonders. In particular, there was a series of miracles involving the actual appearance of flesh or other manifestations of corporality on the altar at the moment of consecration, providing some kind of visual gloss for the mystery.¹

But other experiences of Christ's body, concurrent with these different manifestations of the host, existed on an altogether separate register with markedly different consequences: the revelation of Christ in his human form to select individuals. Such sightings were coextensive and derivative of the first phenomenon. As the work of Caroline Bynum has shown, eucharistic devotion was a powerful leaven for the mystical life, especially among women.² Not only was the mere reception of the Eucharist often the impetus for mystical raptures, but Christ himself was frequently in attendance expounding different levels of meaning to the privileged recipient of mystical experiences. Moreover, the distinctly somatic turn of late medieval spirituality meant that a mystic's body often became a locus for the different aspects of Christ's physi-

¹ On the eucharistic culture of the high Middle Ages, see Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1987); and Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1991). Also see Margaret R. Miles, *Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity and Secular Culture* (Boston, 1985), 96–97.

² See Caroline Walker Bynum, "Women Mystics and Eucharistic Devotion," in *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York, 1991), 125–38; and *Holy Feast*, 69, 76–77.

cality—from his earthly passion to his eucharistic sacrifice, graphically manifesting obscure points of doctrine. Clerical confidants to these mystics, would, in turn, promote the cults of holy individuals whose visionary and devotional lives particularly vindicated the existence of mysteries such as transubstantiation.

And yet, from the point of view of shoring up the faith, the Christological marvels of the period cut both ways. The plethora of miracles turning on Christ's body in its variegated forms raised questions about the existential status of these occurrences, which would, in turn, generate questions about the faith that had rarely, if ever, been raised. It is no exaggeration to assert that for every proof of the faith implicitly sustained by miraculous manifestations of Christ's body, Christendom paid a tacit price in terms of the destabilizing undercurrents that these same proofs generated. My purpose here is to follow the ebb and flow of some of these undercurrents with a view to understanding what it meant (and ultimately what it cost) to witness the body of Christ. Although it is my intention to focus primarily on apparitions of Christ in his humanity, it is with eucharistic miracles that we must begin, in recognition of the essentially interdependent character of the two kinds of marvels.

THE HOST: A MIRACLE PROVED BY MIRACLES

The transformation of bread and wine into the true presence of Christ's body and blood, a phenomenon that only came to be known as transubstantiation in the wake of Lateran IV (1215),³ was allegedly all the more miraculous insofar as no change was apparent in the material elements. In other words, right from its inception, the miracle of the host held Christendom to an impossibly rigorous standard: that a change of substance be accepted without a concurrent change of accidents. This position flagrantly defied common sense, as a lineage of realists—stretching from the original eucharistic controversy in Carolingian times to the fourteenth-century challenge by John Wycliff—would attest.⁴ But equally important, the very austerity of the doctrine was an obstacle to piety. The faithful simply needed more to go on. In an effort to bridge the gap between Christendom's desire to see Christ, on the one hand,

³ Concilium Lateranense IV, const. 1, in Norman P. Tanner, ed. and trans., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, original text established by G. Alberigo et al., 2 vols. (London, Washington, D.C., 1990), 1:230. Gary Macy, however, demonstrates the lack of consensus over the meaning of transubstantiation, prevailing among both canonists and theologians post-Lateran IV in "The Dogma of Transubstantiation in the Middle Ages," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994): 11–41.

⁴ For a brief introduction to these controversies, see Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 14–20, 324–25.

and so withholding a doctrine, on the other, orthodox authorities permitted and, to a certain extent, created a kind of compromise formation which attempted to placate each of these contradictory sets of demands.

That this orthodox strategy was already in play in the course of the eleventh-century eucharistic controversy is evident in the work of the Norman monk Guitmund, later bishop of Aversa—a student of Lanfranc's, the latter being the champion of what came to be considered the orthodox camp.⁵ The “heretical” position denied the host's miraculous change into the body and blood of Christ—adducing proofs such as the fact that the consecrated elements can putrefy, while the real body of Christ would be incorruptible.⁶ Guitmund refutes so banal a possibility categorically, rather positing that such corruption should, instead, be interpreted as a kind of miracle tailor-made to fit the spiritual state of the observer. Taking his lead from Gregory the Great, Guitmund invokes the incident in which Christ, appearing alternatively as a gardener and then as a pilgrim, was not recognized first by Mary Magdalene (John 20:15) and, later, by his disciples (Luke 24:13).⁷ A level of incredulity inhibited them from recognizing the Lord. By analogy, a putrefying host can, likewise, be construed as a reflection of the viewer's incredulity with regard to its miraculous change. Alternatively, this very putrefaction could also represent a reward for an individual who does not waver in his belief, despite this test of faith. Thus when Christ appeared as a leper before a certain martyr, this is likewise to be construed as reward for his humility. Out of respect for the mystery in and of itself and as a repository of meaning, Guitmund denies it to be possible for a mouse or some other animal to chew the consecrated host. Any evidence to the contrary is likened to the appearance of the pilgrim, the gardener, or the leper, intended to either reward or punish the beholder.⁸

Therefore Guitmund resorts to the analogues of biblical sightings of Christ to demonstrate that physical appearances often belie the hidden reality. A putrefying host is only apparently, not actually, in a state of decomposition. But, additionally enlisting the mechanism for what will become more standard

⁵ Lanfranc's struggle with Berengar of Tours has been exhaustively examined in Jean de Montclos, *Lanfranc et Bérenger: La controverse eucharistique du XI^e siècle*, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Etudes et documents, fasc. 37 (Leuven, 1971); see 431–34 concerning Guitmund. Also see Gary Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to Theologians c. 1080–c. 1220* (Oxford, 1984), 48–49. Macy notes that Guitmund's treatise went further than the other anti-Berengar tracts in its insistence on Christ's “substantial presence” in the sacrament.

⁶ Guitmund, *De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in eucharistia* 2, PL 149:1446.

⁷ Ibid. Note, however, that Guitmund reverses the biblical order of these examples, placing the disciples' sighting first. See Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in evangelia*, ed. Raymond Étaix, CCL 141 (Turnhout, 1999), 193–94.

⁸ Guitmund, *De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in eucharistia* 2, PL 149:1447–48.

eucharistic miracles, Guitmund also insists on incidents in which the host miraculously reveals its inner reality, thus having it both ways. On the basis of Lanfranc's experience as a boy in Italy, Guitmund recounts how real flesh and blood appeared on the altar during the course of a mass. After a careful consultation with the other bishops, these elements were eventually treated like relics and enclosed in the altar.⁹ Such miracles would silence the soon to be familiar heretical taunt which, as Guitmund makes clear, was already afoot in his time: that if the bread and wine were really transformed into Christ's body, it would have been consumed long ago—even if it was as big as a mountain.¹⁰

When the scholasticism of the high Middle Ages came to engage these issues, the focus had shifted somewhat insofar as the miracles that were seemingly generated in order to prove the true presence were beginning to raise as many questions as they had originally settled. And certain positions had become unfashionable in light of the burgeoning of Aristotelianism, which ushered in a greater respect for the possible rules governing the natural world. Thus Thomas Aquinas (†1274), much more inclined to credit the testimony of his senses, was also prepared to grant that a consecrated host could decompose, though he maintained that the sacramental species remains intact.¹¹

But particularly noteworthy is Thomas's concern over what might be construed as the “ethics” of the miracles in question. When probing the miraculous manifestation of the host as a child or as a piece of bleeding flesh, Thomas posits that this can occur in two ways. It can either occur subjectively, whereby the eyes of the beholders are acted upon, but there is no change in the host itself. Such is the case when an apparition is visited upon only one person present amid a group of people. Thomas's quick assertion of the essential honesty of this arrangement only serves to underline its potentially disturbing resonances:

in all this, however, there is no deception such as there is in a magician's tricks (*sicut accidit in magorum praestigiis*), because this kind of image is formed by God in the eye of the beholder in order to signify a certain truth, namely, that the body of Christ is present in the sacrament; it was after this

⁹ *Ibid.*, 1449–50.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1450. The same taunts occur among the later Cathar heretics. The Cistercian Peter of Vaux de Cernay, writing ca. 1213, tells how Cathars reject orthodox claims, maintaining that “even were it [the body of Christ] as great as the Alps, [it] would long since have been completely consumed by communicants” (trans. in Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* [New York, 1969], 238–239; also see 721 n. 24).

¹¹ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* (ST) 3.77.4, ed. and trans. English Dominicans, 61 vols. (London, 1964–81), 45:138–43.

fashion too, without any deception, that Christ appeared to the disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke 24:16).¹²

One can sense Aquinas's own discomfort with orthodoxy's compromise formation, which simultaneously seeks to affirm and deny the physicality of the change. In his hasty disavowal, which attempts to effect a distance between the marvel and the cheap tricks of a magician (all the while employing rhetorical strategies that render him vulnerable to similar charges), we can apprehend the Freudian principle of affirmation by route of negation.¹³ Moreover, the evocation of the magician's tricks is a tacit reminder of frauds such as Simon Magus who claimed that he could, among other things, make himself invisible, dig his way out of a mountain, change his appearance, shapeshift into a goat, make trees flower, create a boy from air, make statues walk, pass through fire unharmed, make brazen dogs bark, and himself fly.¹⁴ As Nicetas, a former follower of Simon, would inquire of St. Peter, if the divinely wrought magic of Moses was basically indistinguishable from the tricks effected by Pharaoh's magicians, how could the Egyptians be construed as sinning for not crediting the mission of Moses?¹⁵ Like Nicetas, Aquinas was tacitly acknowledging the dangerous parallels between magic and miracle. The privileged recipient of a eucharistic miracle was not unlike the victim of demonic illusion: both were subject to a kind of glamour being cast over his or her senses in isolation from others.

Thomas's assessment of the "objective" manifestation, whereby an entire group of people witnesses the host's miraculous change for an extended period, is equally troubling. While noting that certain individuals would interpret this as an indication that Christ's natural form was on display, manifesting a variableness that accords with the enhanced potentiality of the glorified body, from Thomas's perspective, this interpretation is misguided. Christ in his "natural form" can only be in one place at a time. Since he is being adored in heaven, his "natural form" can hardly be present in the sacrament. Moreover, the glorified body of Christ can appear and disappear at

¹² Aquinas, *ST* 3.76.8, 58:120–21; cf. Tullio Gregory, "La tromperie divine," in *Preuve et raisons à l'Université de Paris: Logique, ontologie et théologie au XIV^e siècle*, ed. Zénon Kaluza and Paul Vigneaux (Paris, 1984), 187–88.

¹³ Sigmund Freud, "Negation," in vol. 19 of *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. James Strachey (London, 1957), 235–39.

¹⁴ Ps.-Clement of Rome, *Recognitions* 2.9, 2.15, 3.47, trans. Thomas Smith in vol. 8 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Buffalo, 1886), 99, 101, 126. Simon wanted to be taken for Christ, and called himself the "Standing One," implying that he was beyond corruption (1.72, 2.7, pp. 96, 99). Also see the *Apostolic Constitutions* 2.9, trans. James Donaldson in vol. 7 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Buffalo, 1888), 453.

¹⁵ Ps.-Clement of Rome, *Recognitions* 3.57, trans. Smith, 129.

will, even as we read in the gospel that Christ suddenly vanished from the apostles' sight (Luke 24:31). The "objective" appearance of the sacrament, however, lasts a long time. Invoking Guitmund's retelling of the story from Lanfranc's boyhood, Thomas notes that, after consultation, the bishops treated the sacrament like a reserved host ("quandoque esse inclusum, et multorum episcoporum consilio in pixide reservatum")—a move that would have been inappropriate had Christ been in his "natural form." Instead, Thomas concludes that a miraculous change occurs in the sacrament's accidental qualities, again underlining that "there is no deception in all this, because it all happens in order to express a certain truth, and the miraculous appearance is to show that the body and blood of Christ are really present in the sacrament."¹⁶

Efforts to dispel a parallel ethically grounded objection likewise inform Thomas's engagement of the seemliness of Christ's post-resurrection appearances to his apostles, "Whether Christ should have appeared to his disciples under another form." In answer to the initial objection that such appearances were unfitting as they could only be achieved through tricks (*praestigiis*), Aquinas again affirms, in keeping with the sentiments attributed to Gregory the Great above, that the ability to apprehend Christ correctly was shaped by the spiritual capacity of each individual to believe in the resurrection.¹⁷ Although Christ is certainly able to present himself in an unrecognizable form that remains in keeping with an ulterior truth, in this instance the disciples' powers of recognition were probably inhibited by Satan, since the gospel stated that something prevented them from recognizing him.¹⁸ There was definitely trickery afoot. But the trickery was generated by Satan, not Christ—a point to which I will return below.

BETWEEN SPIRITUAL AND CORPOREAL VISIONS

The above discussions emphasize the inextricable linkages of eucharistic marvels with appearances of Christ. Clearly the incredible nature of the doc-

¹⁶ Thomas Aquinas, *ST* 3.76.8., 58:122–23; cf. *idem*, *In IV Sent.* 10.4.2, ed. P. Mandonnet and M. F. Moos *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1929–47), 4:420–26; also cf. his discussion of the nature of Christ's glorified body after the resurrection (*ST* 3.54.1–2, 58:18–27). See Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336* (New York, 1995), 264.

¹⁷ Aquinas, *ST* 3.55.4, 55:50–51. Note that the mystery plays of the later Middle Ages are especially intrigued by the concept of Christ the "trickster," who tricks Satan through his disguised divinity. This is something of a reversal from eucharistic miracles, in which humanity breaks through a surface of unchanged accidents. In the theology of atonement, however, divinity is wrapped in flesh and only breaks through or appears later.

¹⁸ Aquinas, *ST* 3.55.4 ad 2, 55:50–54; cf. Luke 24:16.

trine of transubstantiation required supplementation with concrete marvels of flesh and blood. Fervent efforts to intellectualize what was being demonstrated would, in turn, cause scholars to equate eucharistic miracles with other inexplicable sightings of Christ's body, evoking the biblical post-resurrection tradition in which Christ was present in the body, but literally unrecognizable. Yet eucharistic devotion would also inspire sightings of Christ which were much closer to home. These appearances were, arguably, even more challenging than the inexplicable appearances of flesh on the altar since they featured an animated and often loquacious Lord.

Intrinsic to these new devotional manifestations was an emphasis on mentally picturing the passion, and the events surrounding Christ's life, generally—patterns assessed in the work of scholars like Chiara Frugoni and Jeffrey Hamburger.¹⁹ Through various images, perhaps epitomized in the widespread representation of Christ's face in copies of the Veronica cloth or the description contained in the Lentulus letter, most pious Christians had a distinct sense of what Christ looked like and were encouraged to imagine him in the context of the pivotal events surrounding his life and death.²⁰ Nor was Christendom entirely surprised when its Lord strode into the lives of a select circle. Thomas of Cantimpré († ca. 1270), for example, an early observer of the Beguine movement and chronicler of the Dominicans, relates a number of instances in which the timely appearance of Christ precipitated or sustained a conversion. His *vita* of his spiritual mentor, Lutgard of Aywières, relates how she was freed of her attachment to a carnal lover by the appearance of a wounded Christ. A parallel incident occurs in *De apibus*, allegedly Thomas's history of the Dominican order, in which an anonymous virgin's affection for a certain youth is undermined by the appearance of a wounded Christ who

¹⁹ See Chiara Frugoni, "Female Mystics, Visions, and Iconography," in *Women and Religion in Medieval and Renaissance Italy*, ed. Daniel Bornstein and Roberto Rusconi, trans. Margery J. Schneider (Chicago and London, 1996), 130–64; Jeffrey F. Hamburger, *Nuns as Artists: The Visual Culture of a Medieval Convent* (Berkeley and Los Angelos, 1997), 101–36. Meditation on the *arma Christi*, the wounds occurring in the course of Christ's passion and the weapons responsible for inflicting these wounds, developed in the later Middle Ages. See, for example, the meditational treatise written by the Dominican inquisitor Kolda, lector of the St. Klemenskloster in Prague 1312–1314, at the request of abbess Cunegund, ed. Augustinus Scherzer, "Der Prager Lektor Fr. Kolda und seine mystischen Traktate," *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 18 (1948): 337–96.

²⁰ For some fascinating images of the Veronica cloth and efforts at achieving the true likeness of Christ, see the catalogue for the recent exhibition "Seeing Salvation" at the National Gallery, London, 26 February–7 May 2000, *The Image of Christ*, Gabriele Finaldi et al. (London, 2000), esp. pt. 3, "The True Likeness," 74–193. For Veronica's veil, see particularly pp. 75–76. The Lentulus letter was ostensibly sent by the governor, Publius Lentulus of Judea, to Octavius Caesar. It contains a purported description of Christ, which concludes by portraying him as "a man, for singular beauty, far exceeding all the sons of men" (94).

sings her a love ditty in the vernacular.²¹ This same work also relates how a Cistercian monk, gravely tempted to apostatize, was confronted by Christ in the form of a *personatissimus vir*. Christ offered the monk a large chunk of bread soaked in the gore from his wounds. At first recoiling in horror, and exclaiming that he could not eat anything so polluted, the monk finally yielded and his temptation disappeared.²² (Women's greater propensity for this kind of devotion can be gauged by the gratifying alacrity with which the later Angela of Foligno would respond to a parallel invitation.)²³

What did it actually signify to say that Christ appeared to these individuals? How was he understood to be seen—physically or in a more abstract mode?²⁴ The medieval discourse on vision, which was indebted to Augustine's views, posited a three-fold ascending hierarchy of sight. The first two consisted of corporeal vision, which was reliant on the senses, and spiritual vision, which utilized images stored in the imagination.²⁵ Since the third and highest category, intellectual vision, was entirely free of any dependence on images, appearances of Christ would presumably register in one of the two lower categories. If Christ's appearance was understood in terms of spiritual vision, two possible ways of comprehending such phenomena might present themselves to the medieval understanding. First, the perception of Christ in the spiritual vision could be construed as arising naturally from the contemplative life of a given mystic. Devotional images, stored in the memory and accessed

²¹ Thomas of Cantimpré, *Vita S. Lutgardis*, *AA SS Jun. IV* (Paris and Rome, 1867), 192; trans. Margot H. King, *The Life of Lutgard of Aywières* 1.1.2 (Saskatoon, 1987), 6. See King's comments in n. 38, pp. 116–17, and n. 39, p. 117; cf. idem, *Bonum universale de apibus (De apibus)* 2.57.25 (Douai, 1627), 556–57. The words in question were "You ought to love me, I am so noble/ handsome, and good, sweet and loyal" ("Moy dois aimer, ie suis tresbiau/ Bons, et doux, noble, et louay").

²² Thomas of Cantimpré, *De apibus* 2.57.26, pp. 557–58. Note that when treating the miraculous appearance of flesh on the altar during the Mass, Aquinas argues that it ought not to be eaten because "nihil horrendum est committendum in hoc sacramento. Sed horrendum est comedere carnem crudam. Ergo illud quod in substantia carnis crudaæ appetet, non est sumendum" (*In IV Sent.* 10.4.3 sed contra, 4:421).

²³ She designates this as the fourteenth step of the twenty ways of penitence (*Il libro della Beata Angela da Foligno* 1.1, ed. Lüdger Thier and Abele Calufetti, *Spicilegium Bonaventurianum* 25 [Grottaferrata, Rome, 1985], 142–44; trans. Paul Lachance, in *Angela of Foligno: Complete Works* [New York, 1993], 128).

²⁴ Cf. Caroline Walker Bynum's interesting reflections on these questions in "The Woman in the Pearl Necklace," *Common Knowledge* 8 (2002): 280–83.

²⁵ See Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 12.25, ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 28/1 (Vienna, 1894), 417–18; trans. John Hammond Taylor, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 2 vols. Ancient Christian Writers 42 (New York, 1982), 2:215–16. On the relationship between Augustine's view of corporeal vision and the ultimate vision of God, see Margaret Miles, "Vision: The Eye of the Body and the Eye of the Mind in Saint Augustine's *De trinitate* and *Confessions*," *The Journal of Religion* 63 (1983): 125–42.

by the imaginative virtue that presided over spiritual vision, would supply the raw material for such visions. We can see a version of this mechanism being alluded to in the lives of individual saints. For instance, at the process of canonization for Clare of Montefalco (†1308), one of the witnesses claimed that she had the kind of imaginative capacity that allowed her to apply inwardly to Christ's passion whatever she observed.²⁶ It is perhaps in this context that the visionary Christ appeared to Clare carrying his cross, searching for a place to plant it.²⁷

Would the recipient of a spiritual vision of this sort recognize at the time that the experience in question was limited to the imagination as opposed to existing independently in external reality? Jean Gerson (†1429) believed that there were many who could not, referring with contempt to individuals who, when meditating in the course of Mass, actually believed that Christ appeared before them—a dementia which represented, to his mind, a total confusion between the internal and external realities.²⁸ (One might contend by way of riposte that a confusion such as this is an appropriate response to transubstantiation since, like a eucharistic miracle, it enacts interior realities on the outside.) For this reason, Gerson urged the necessity of stripping oneself of all shapes and phantasms in the course of meditation.²⁹ Those who begin their meditation with corporeal images leave themselves prone to the most filthy thoughts or the kind of madness afflicting the lovesick (*philocapti*).³⁰ While stopping short of the abolition of images, Gerson nevertheless recommended the gradual withdrawal from corporeal images for purposes of meditation “because in all of them there are snares, nooses, little traps for the feet of the foolish, according to the wise man (Wisdom 14:11).”³¹

The second possibility, also enlisting the faculty of spiritual vision, was that such apparitions of Christ were similar to the appearance of ghosts—a non-physical form possessed of the semblance of animation. Such figures bore no direct relation to the beings they represented, however. In fact, according to Augustine at any rate, these images shared the same essential character with

²⁶ Enrico Menestò, ed., *Il processo di canonizzazione di Chiara da Montefalco* (Regione dell'Umbria, 1984), witness 39, art. 47, p. 194: “. . . credit quod habebat istam inmaginationem, quod ea que videbat exterius applicabat ad passionem Christi.”

²⁷ *Ibid.*, witness 39, art. 128, pp. 233–34.

²⁸ Jean Gerson, *De meditatione cordis*, in *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Palémon Glorieux, 10 vols. (Paris, 1960–73), 8:83–84.

²⁹ Jean Gerson, *De simplificatione cordis*, in *Oeuvres complètes* 8:85. Gerson thereby commends the Ps.-Dionysius's ruthless abolition of imperfect phantasms (*ibid.* 8:88).

³⁰ *Ibid.* 8:94.

³¹ “. . . quoniam in eis omnibus laquei sunt, tendicula sunt, decipulae sunt, juxta sententiam Sapientis, pedibus insipientium” (*ibid.* 8:96).

the appearance of living persons in the course of a dream: such individuals would be in no way cognizant of their spectral appearances to various dreamers.³² Rather, these apparitions were achieved through the mediation of angels who acted as intermediaries between the living and dead; or possibly through the intervention of martyrs, who seemed to participate in aspects of the angelic role as go-between; or even the hybrid of angels taking upon themselves the persona of martyrs (“per angelos suscipientes personam martyrum”).³³

When analyzing medieval accounts of ghostly apparitions, Jean-Claude Schmitt stresses the qualified nature of most of these descriptions. The apparitions in question seemed animate and material, but such an impression was only illusory—a tentativeness frequently conveyed through the word *quasi* (“as if” or “as it were”).³⁴ This quality of uncertainty is not always a prominent feature in Christ’s appearances in various mystical contexts, however. Frequently, perhaps by way of shorthand—the mere “fact” of Christ’s appearance is alleged in mystical narratives. And yet, if such assertions be taken at face value, they are possessed of a certain logic: Christ’s appearances must necessarily be accorded a very different status than that of ghosts—even the very holy ghosts of martyrs. For Christ’s soul was, after all, already rejoined with his material—albeit glorified—body, and could theoretically appear on earth in this body whenever he should so desire.

But there are also the occasional descriptions of the nature of the vision enlisted in the course of a mystical revelation, more often than not formulated by a clerical supporter in defense of his spiritual client’s visionary life. Versed in a kind clerical circumspection, these accounts back away from strictly corporeal claims. One of several confessors to Bridget of Sweden (†1373), for example, the theologian Master Mathias, describes Christ as appearing to her in spirit (*in spiritu sibi apparens*). Yet this appearance is presented as quasi-illusory, analogous with human misperceptions in the natural order. “Just as when the mountains and woods are examined the sky seems close to their tops, although it is not, so also Christ, reigning in heaven is able to seem near

³² Augustine, *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* 13, ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 4 (Vienna, 1900), 641–43; trans. H. Browne in *St. Augustine: On the Holy Trinity, Doctrinal Treatises, Moral Treatises, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, first series, 3 (rpt. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1956), 545–46. See Jean-Claude Schmitt’s discussion of medieval vision and the how this pertains to apparitions of the dead in *Ghosts in the Middle Ages: The Living and the Dead in Medieval Society*, trans. Teresa Lavender Fagan (Chicago, 1998), 21–27. For his discussion of Augustine’s treatise, see esp. pp. 20–22.

³³ Augustine, *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* 18, 19, 20, ed. Zycha, 650–51, 652–53, 654; trans. Browne, 548, 548–49, 549.

³⁴ Schmitt, *Ghosts*, 25.

by spiritual vision, although his corporeal presence is far."³⁵ Alphonse of Pecha (†1388), another confessor to Bridget who actually produced an independent treatise defending her visions, analyzed the mechanics of her experience in some detail—a treatment that merits citing at length.

But you would ask how it is possible that the blessed lady, in waking prayer, was able to see, just as she often saw, rapt in spirit, Christ and his virgin mother and the angels and saints, who always immutably and essentially remain in heaven, and in the same moment to see the souls tortured in purgatory and hell and even demons speaking, and whether when the said lady saw these things her soul was within or outside the body. To which question not I, but she, the mirror of all wisdom and knowledge, Mary, the queen of heaven, answers you most beautifully in [Bridget's revelations] . . . where it is determined that this was done by marvelous elevation and illustration of the mind and understanding for the great utility of the entire body of the Church, with the cooperation and ministry of the Holy Spirit. Sometimes indeed by some shape of Christ or of saints some great things were infused in an instant in the intellect of the same blessed lady—namely the answers of questions, revelations of mysteries, direction for virtuous acts, and the rule of a holy life through a certain influx of divine supernatural light. . . . Sometimes also she saw an angel with her corporeal eyes. . . . Sometimes also the aforesaid blessed lady saw the Lord Jesus Christ and his mother the Virgin not only in spirit, but also with her corporeal eyes—especially toward the end of her life.³⁶

³⁵ "Sed sicut . . . cum aspiciuntur montes et silue, videtur celum eminentie eorum propinquum, licet non sit, sic et Christus, in celo regnans, spirituali visione propinquus videri poterit, quantumlibet corporali presencia remotus sit" (*Sancta Birgitta: Revelaciones*, Book 1, ed. Carl-Gustaf Undhagen, Samlingar utgivna av Svenska Fornskriftsällskapet, ser. 2, Latinska Skrifter, vol. 7.1 [Uppsala, 1978], Mathias's prologue, p. 234). For a discussion on the nature of Bridget's visions, Claire L. Sahlin, *Birgitta of Sweden and the Voice of Prophecy* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2001), 54–71; note that the visionary Christ explains the need for corporeal imagery regarding spiritual matters (*ibid.*, 68). For combined clerical efforts at legitimizing Bridget's mystical experience, see Dyan Elliott, "The Physiology of Rapture and Female Spirituality," in *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*, ed. Peter Biller and A. J. Minnis (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1997), 164–66.

³⁶ "Sed poteris querere, quomodo potest esse, quod ista beata domina in oracione vigilante, poterat videre, sicut sepe videbat, rapta in spiritu, Christum et eius matrem et angelos et sanctos, qui semper immutabiliter et essencialiter stant in celo et in eodem instanti videre animas cruciari ac eas et eciam demones loquentes in purgatorio et in inferno . . . et vtrum quando hec videbat dicta domina, anima eius erat in corpore vel an extra corpus. Ad quam questionem non ego, sed illa, speculum omnis sapientie et scientie, regina celi, Maria tibi respondet valde pulcre in VI libri, LII capitulo in fine cum similibus, ubi determinatur, quod hoc mira eleuacione et illustracione mentis et intelligencie beate Brigide ad magnam vtilitatem tocius corporis Ecclesie cooperacione et ministerio Spiritus Sancti. Aliquando quippe visa in extasi aliqua species Christi vel sanctorum, infundebantur in momento intellectui eiusdem beate domine aliqua magnalia, scilicet soluciones questionum, reuelaciones misteriorum et direcciones actuum virtuo-

Certainly, Alphonse seems to corroborate Mathias's account in the main. Bridget's visions were primarily spiritual, occurring internally by certain *species* acting on her imaginative faculty. Christ, his mother, and the specters of the tortured dead presumably remained in their respective places, while Bridget's rapt soul was infused with their images. Thus despite Alphonse's immense claims for Bridget's visions in other respects, attempting to have them accorded a similar status to biblical revelation, he did not seek special status for the means of their reception, basically concurring with the mainstream position, articulated earlier by Aquinas, that Christ in his natural form remained in heaven until his second coming. Yet Alphonse's alignment with this position is seriously eroded by additionally noting that Bridget saw both Christ and his mother with her corporeal eyes. This assertion does more than simply undercut the efforts to categorize the visions as strictly spiritual; it tacitly undermines Mathias's proud contention that Bridget's spiritual manner of viewing was more spectacular than if she had witnessed Christ's presence in the flesh by suggesting that, late in life, she gradually gained the reward of seeing Christ with her corporeal eyes.³⁷ Other circumstances surrounding Bridget's reception of visions further confirm a sense of the blurring between the corporeal and spiritual senses. In particular, when Christ first attempted to address Bridget when she was caught up in mystical rapture in her chapel, her immediate response was to run to her bedroom, as if she could escape him physically—a reaction which was said to have been repeated on yet another occasion before she eventually gave Christ's form a hearing.³⁸

A fluidity between different registers of existence is, of course, common enough in hagiographical discourse—especially regarding certain pivotal ex-

sorum et regula sancte vite per quendam influxum supernaturalis luminis divini. . . . Aliquando eciam angelum corporeis oculis ipsa videbat. . . . Aliquociens quoque vidit predicta beata domina non solum in spiritu, immo eciam suis beatis oculis corporalibus dominum Iesum Christum et matrem eius virginem et presertim in fine vite sue" (Alphonse of Jaén, *Epistola solitarii ad reges* 4, ed. A. Jönsson in *Alfonso of Jaén: His Life and Works with Critical Editions of the 'Epistola solitarii,' the 'Informaciones' and the 'Epistola servi Christi'*, Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 1 [Lund, 1989], 138–40). On this work, see Eric Colledge, "Epistola solitarii ad reges: Alphonse of Pechal as Organizer of Birgittine and Urbanist Propaganda," *Mediaeval Studies* 18 (1956): 19–49; and Rosalynn Voaden, *God's Words, Women's Voices: The Discernment of Spirits in the Writing of Late-Medieval Women Visionaries* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1999), 79–93. Also see Bridget Morris, *St Birgitta of Sweden* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1999), 152–58.

³⁷ *Sancta Birgitta: Revelaciones, Book I*, ed. Undhagen, Mathias's prologue, p. 234.

³⁸ Prior Peter Olafson and Master Peter Olafson, in *Acta et Processus Canonizacionis Beate Birgitte*, ed. Isak Collijn Samlingar utgivna av Svenska Fornskriftsällskapet, ser. 2, Latinska Skrifter, vol. 1 (Uppsala, 1924–31), 80–81; trans. Albert Ryle Kezel "The Life of Blessed Birgitta," chap. 26, in *Birgitta of Sweden: Life and Selected Revelations* (New York, 1990), 77–78.

periences in the lives of various saints. One of the most familiar examples occurs in the life of Francis of Assisi (†1226) when he is told by Christ to repair his church—a command that seemed to issue from the crucifix in the church of San Damiano. Speaking crucifixes will soon become a staple of the exemplum tradition.³⁹ But parallel conflations of the corporeal and spiritual senses can take many forms. One of the more original blurrings of corporeal and spiritual senses occurs in the life of Dorothea of Montau (†1394). A Prussian recluse living in an anchorhold (*reclusorium*) in the church of Marienwerder, Dorothea was addressed, and began to converse, with the entity with whom she, arguably, had the most in common in the vicinity—the reserved host locked up in its *reservaculum*. Hence Christ, speaking in the form of the host, said to her, “You compelled me with your abundant tears and clamour so that now I am made your neighbour, nor is there any other person closer to you than I am now,” and required her to give thanks for permitting himself to be enclosed in response to her eucharistic hunger; we are, moreover, informed that the sound proceeded distinctly from the little window of the *reservaculum* and reached the corporeal ears of Dorothea, “and this occurred only rarely; for usually the voice of the Lord sounded without the clash of words in the spiritual ears of her soul.”⁴⁰ On a discursive level, the episode does not merely suggest, but cultivates that confusion between inner and outer so despised by Jean Gerson. In addition to conflating the various kinds of apprehension, the personified host propels a similar merging of two ways of experiencing Christ’s body—as eucharistic meal and as apparitional mentor. This kind of admixture tacitly undercuts the prevailing orthodoxy that the physical Christ remained in heaven.

Clearly theological sponsors of Bridget and Dorothea were heroically struggling to keep their holy penitents’ experiences within the ordained contours of

³⁹ See *Legenda trium sociorum* 5, in *Fontes Franciscani*, ed. Enrico Menestò and Stefano Brufani (Assisi, 1995), 1385–86; ed. and trans. in *St. Francis of Assisi: Writings and Early Biographies*, ed. Marion Habig (Chicago, 1973), 903–4. Also see Frederic C. Tubach, *Index Exemplorum: A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales*, Folklore Fellows Communications 204 (Helsinki, 1969), no. 998c. On the phenomenon of the talking image, see André Vauchez, “L’image vivante: Quelques réflexions sur les fonctions des représentations iconographiques dans le domaine religieux en Occident aux derniers siècles du moyen âge,” in *Arme und Reiche: Studien aus der Geschichte der Gesellschaft und der Kultur. Bronislaw Geremek zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet* (Warsaw, 1992), esp. 235–36.

⁴⁰ “Tu coegisti me cum largis lacrimis tuis et clamore, quod iam sum effectus vicinus tuus, nec est aliis nunc tibi me vicinior.” . . . Et hoc raro solebat fieri; nam regulariter vox Domini insonuit sine strepitu verborum ad aures anime spirituales” (John Marienwerder, *Vita Dorotheae Montoviensis Magistri Johannis Marienwerder* 5.39.d, ed. Hans Westpfahl, *Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte Ostdeutschlands* 1 [Cologne and Graz, 1964], 274–75).

orthodoxy's determinations on visions, but with only partial success. The logic of the miracle favoured the corporeal over the spiritual—particularly in this age of intensely somatic spirituality. Mathias's strategy for counteracting this trend by suggesting that Bridget's spiritual visions outstripped a possible corporeal correlative, just as spirit is superior to matter, was doomed from the start—even without Alphonse's tacit contradiction. The desire for apprehending a Christ who was more than just an apparition was seemingly too strong.

THE SATANIC CHRIST

In a speculative and representational field already riven with tensions about the nature and reliability of Christ's appearances, the issue of deception is bound to arise. Thomas of Cantimpré, no mean skeptic about quasi-corporeal sightings of Christ, demonstrates the way in which demons could wreak havoc through what one of their heretical agents designates as ocular faith (*oculata fides*).⁴¹ Bridget's repeated flight from the apparitional Christ is a dramatic allusion to the possibility of diabolical deception, marking her as an excellent student of the ascetical and hagiographical tradition of the early church in which similar appearances of Christ were, more often than not, demonic illusions testing a given ascetic's level of humility. The impeccable response to an appearance of "Christ" is one of supreme skepticism. Several instances from the *Vitae patrum* can be taken as representative. One old monk shut his eyes, asserting plaintively: "I don't want to see Christ in this life." Another evoked Christ's own words: "if any man shall say to you: Lo here is Christ, or there, do not believe him" (Matthew 24:23).⁴² St. Friard, whose life is recounted by Gregory of Tours (†594), instantly recognizes that his companion, the deacon Secundellus, has been deceived by a Satanic Christ, despite the fact that the latter's advice—that Secundellus leave his cell in order to effect cures—actually eventuated in miracles.⁴³

⁴¹ Thomas of Cantimpré, *De apibus* 2.57.23, pp. 553–55. The proselytizing heretic, pitying those whose faith depended on the written word alone, offered a spectacular demonic sham consisting of a simulation of the Virgin Mary surrounded by angels and patriarchs. Also see Thomas's discussion of certain illusions of the air, demonically wrought to win people's admiration (2.57.27, pp. 558–59).

⁴² Pelagius and John, trans., *Verba seniorum*, nos. 70–71, PL 73:965–66 ("Ego hic Christum nolo videre, sed in illa vita. . . . Si quis vobis dixerit, Ecce hic Christus, aut ecce illic, nolite credere"). Also see no. 68, in which the devil appears before a monk as the angel Gabriel: the monk tells him to check if he has the right person since he himself is unworthy of such a visitation.

⁴³ Gregory of Tours, *Liber vitae patrum* 10.2, ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH SS Rerum Mero-

In the life of St. Martin of Tours (†397) by Sulpicius Severus († ca. 420), the saint was the recipient of two visitations from Christ figures. The pivotal miracle with which Martin is associated occurs when he shares his cloak with a beggar.⁴⁴ It is only afterwards, when Christ appears to him in a dream invested with half the cloak, that Martin recognizes to whom he had played benefactor. Martin was also assailed by a figure in a royal robe and crown, claiming to be Christ. The demonic charlatan stood before Martin while he was awake—a claim that one translator found sufficiently derisory that he substituted *prece* (“in prayer”) for *prae se* (“in front of him”), thus shifting the register of the experience from corporeal to spiritual vision.⁴⁵ Playing the doubting Thomas, Martin answered: “I will not believe that Christ has come, unless he appears with that appearance and form in which he suffered, and openly displaying the marks of his wounds upon the cross,” and the demon was routed, leaving a foul stench in his wake.⁴⁶

In fact, if one were to assess the theological criteria for the conditions under which Christ might appear in his natural form, the circumstances surrounding the visitation received by Martin were theologically auspicious. Sulpicius anticipates the episode of the Satanic Christ by an account of a certain young Spaniard who first announced himself as Elijah and later as Christ. He developed a popular following, including a bishop named Rufus, who was subsequently deposed. Another figure from the East claimed to be John. Sulpicius concludes: “We may infer from this, since false prophets of such a kind have appeared, that the coming of Antichrist is at hand; for he is already practicing in these persons the mystery of iniquity. And truly I think this point should not be passed over, with what arts the devil about this very time tempted Martin.”⁴⁷ Not only was it precisely in such a context that one might expect

vingicarum 1 (Hannover, 1884), 706–7; trans. Edward James, *Life of the Fathers* (Liverpool, 1985), 85–86. The defeated devil later returned with a host of demons, who attacked Friard with such ferocity that he barely escaped alive.

⁴⁴ Sulpicius Severus, *Vie de Saint Martin* 3, ed. Jacques Fontaine, 3 vols. Sources chrétiennes 133–35 (Paris, 1967–69), 1:256–59; trans. Alexander Roberts, *The Life of Saint Martin*, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, second series, 11 (rpt. Ann Arbor, Mich., 1964), 5.

⁴⁵ Ibid. 24, ed. Fontaine, 1:306–9; trans. Roberts, 15 and n. 1 (where Roberts acknowledges his change). At the end of the episode, where Sulpicius Severus swears to the truth of this occurrence, having learned of it from Martin, Roberts remarks in response: “In spite of the combined testimony of Martin and Sulpitius here referred to, few will have any doubt as to the real character of this narrative” (16 n. 2). On this episode and the skepticism it probably produced among Sulpicius’s contemporaries, see Clare Stansfield, *St. Martin and his Hagiographer* (Oxford, 1983), 235–38; cf. 256–61. In theory, however, the late antique cosmos had no problem accommodating such powers (*ibid.*, 215–27).

⁴⁶ Sulpicius Severus, *Vie de Saint Martin* 24, ed. Fontaine, 1:308–9; trans. Roberts, 16.

⁴⁷ Ibid., ed. Fontaine, 1:306–7; trans. Roberts, 15. Also see the preceding chapter, in which the monk Anatolius claimed to communicate with angels. His proof was in the appearance of a

the second coming of Christ, but the Satanic Christ capitalized on this expectation by saying to Martin: “ ‘I am Christ; and being about to descend to earth, I wished first to manifest myself to thee.’ ”⁴⁸

The experience of St. Martin is especially revelatory of the difference between patristic and late medieval attitudes to visions. For Martin, the authentic experience of Christ was an interior vision, which occurred in a dream. The external manifestation was a Satanic vanity-bait. Martin’s response, that only the appearance of the suffering Christ would compel him to believe, is presented as a near-impossible condition—operating as a rhetorical parry. But these late antique coordinates could no longer be sustained in the later Middle Ages when investment in Christ’s corporality, and the many forms it took, was at a premium. Thus while Jean Gerson, who, as we have seen, was critical of the proliferation of visions in his own time, cites with sincere approbation the resistant stance of figures from the *Vitae patrum*, as well as Martin, he does not make reference to Martin’s legitimate experience of Christ in a dream.⁴⁹ Nor does he mention the saint’s alleged willingness to credit the appearance of a wounded and bleeding Christ, a comment that placed the bar for discernment far too low in a late medieval context. There were just too many bleeding Christs appearing for Gerson’s taste.

This is not to say that the model of ascetical skepticism was moribund, except among of few curmudgeons like Gerson. It was very much alive in the exemplum tradition,⁵⁰ wherein the generic tendency to teach by negative example represented the substantial price that individuals must pay for their self-gratifying credulousness. The Dominican inquisitor, Stephen of Bourbon, tells of a female mystic “[who] began at times to think to herself that she was a pure woman and such a one as would be worthy for the Lord to give her visible consolations.”⁵¹ She was seemingly rewarded by the timely visit of Christ and his retinue. As it turned out, however, the Christ figure was a demon who proceeded to seduce her. “Visible consolations” thus gave way to

marvelous robe representing the power of God. This robe, which was, of course, demonically wrought, disappeared altogether when the monk was led, unwilling, into Martin’s presence (ibid. 23, ed. Fontaine, 1:304–7; trans. Roberts, 15).

⁴⁸ Ibid. 24, ed. Fontaine, 1:308–9; trans. Roberts, 16.

⁴⁹ Jean Gerson, *De distinctione verarum revelationum a falsis*, in *Oeuvres complètes* 3:39; trans. Brian Patrick McGuire, *Jean Gerson: Early Works* (New York, 1998), 339.

⁵⁰ Tubach, *Index Exemplorum*, no. 1536 (the devil as Christ appearing to a hermit).

⁵¹ “Incepit ipsa aliquando apud se cogitare quod esset munda mulier, et talis que esset digna quod Dominus daret ei visibles consolaciones” (A. Lecoy de la Marche, ed., *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apollogues tirés du recueil inédit d’Etienne de Bourbon, Dominicain du XIII^e siècle* [Paris, 1877], 198–99). I discuss this incident in the context of female physiology in *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1999), 54.

illicit physical consolations. The demon was eventually routed as a result of sacramental confession.

And yet despite a continued awareness of the way in which Satan could disguise himself as an angel of light, and the continued need for spiritual discernment, this gift of the spirit was rarely demonstrated on alleged Christ figures, perhaps because such appearances were too close to home. There are some notable exceptions. St. Francis correctly discerned the diabolic nature of the “Christ” who appeared to Brother Rufino and asserted that neither Rufino nor Francis were among the elect.⁵² The devil appeared to Catherine of Bologna (†1463) three times as the crucified Christ and once as the Virgin holding the baby Jesus.⁵³ A more oblique instance occurs in the life of Clare of Montefalco, who was reported to have been present in a certain house where a demon in the shape of a crucifix was being idolatrously worshipped by the so-called members of the Free Spirit. Men and women whipped themselves into a frenzy and then fell into the heated exercise of carnal lust—thereby exemplifying the filthy imaginings which Gerson had associated with image-based meditation. Despite the rather circumspect description, the demonic presence could be construed as a disconcerting reenactment of Francis’s original communication with the painted Christ of the crucifix at the church of San Damiano.⁵⁴ Yet generally, with regard to Christological phenomena, the power of discernment is only rarely demonstrated by the unmasking of a Satanic Christ.⁵⁵ Far more imaginative energy is invested in the discernment of

⁵² See *Actus B. Francisci et sociorum eius* 33, ed. Menestò and Brufani in *Fontes Franciscani*, 2158–59; trans. Habig, *St. Francis of Assisi*, 1372–75 (chap. 25). Francis said that the next time the devil appeared in this guise, Rufino should volunteer to empty his bowels in his diabolical mouth. This episode seemed to have been toned down somewhat for the exemplum tradition. Thus when a companion of St. Francis sees a devil in the form of a crucifix, he is told by the saint himself to spit on it (Tubach, *Index Exemplorum*, no. 1537). This anecdote is attributed to Bernardino of Siena. See *Novelletee, esempi morali e apologhi di San Bernardino da Siena, Scelta di curiosità letterari* (Bologna, 1868), no. 22, pp. 53–57.

⁵³ AA SS Mar. II (Paris and Rome, 1865), 37. What is perhaps more exceptional still is that God permitted her to be deceived, at least temporarily. This life, written by Dionysius Paleotti—a Franciscan of the Observance—was written some fifty years after her death in 1463.

⁵⁴ See Menestò, ed., *Il processo di canonizzazione di Chiara da Montefalco*, witness 1, art. 86, p. 43; witness 45, art. 86, p. 280.

⁵⁵ The discernment of a diabolical Christ might be deflected into other illusions. Female visionaries, for example, are often assailed by the appearance of Satan masquerading as their confessors—who, in their sacramental capacity, could be considered as substitutes for Christ. See my discussion of such an instance in the life of Frances of Rome: “*Dominae or Dominatae?: Female Mystics and the Trauma of Textuality*,” in *Women, Marriage, and Family in Medieval Christendom: Essays in Memory of Michael M. Sheehan, C.S.B.*, ed. Constance Rousseau and Joel Rosenthal (Kalamazoo, 1998), 47–48.

Christ's sacramental body: female mystics in particular were adepts at differentiating between a consecrated and unconsecrated host.⁵⁶

MEDIEVAL SCHOLASTICISM AND THE TRICKERY OF GOD

It was not long before the very prolixity of Christological appearances began to resonate in other discourses in frequently incalculable ways. The collision of such appearances with late medieval scholasticism was particularly noteworthy. On the one hand, there was the response of pastoral theologians to develop a formal literature of spiritual discernment that would not only supplement, but even attempt to supplant the charismatic initiatives of women like Clare. As the treatment of visions by clerics such as Jean Gerson suggest, the levels of causality were somewhat more variegated than the simple divine/diabolical polarity implied. Gerson, for example, would utilize a quasi-medicalized discourse for determining the origins of a vision. Thus his example of a contemporary woman who frequently saw Christ flying through the air is, accordingly, treated as a symptom: "this sign of truth has shown, unless I am mistaken, that she was out of her mind."⁵⁷ On the other hand, we also find more theoretical approaches to visions which tend to probe both the metaphysical and moral meaning of such supernatural occurrences, an analytical reflex which ultimately has far-reaching implications for what might be described as the ethics of the divine. It is to this second discourse to which I will turn my attention.

The problem is rooted in the very derivativeness of human vision, and the limitations this necessarily imposes on human understanding. The dominant view of late medieval scholasticism was the Aristotelian-inflected one upheld by Aquinas: that understanding was impossible without the use of images that were dependent on the corporeal senses (*phantasmata*).⁵⁸ The same principle is at work with respect to the gift of prophecy, by which God illuminates the forms (*species*) already present in the human mind in addition to infusing new ones.⁵⁹ The implications of this dependency are, of course, legion—even in-

⁵⁶ See Bynum, *Holy Feast*, 228–29.

⁵⁷ Gerson, *De distinctione verarum revelationum a falsis*, 3:51; trans. McGuire, 356. On Gerson and the discernment of spirits in the later Middle Ages, see Voaden, *God's Words*, 41–43, 55–58, 67–68; and Dyan Elliott, "Seeing Double: Jean Gerson, the Discernment of Spirits, and Joan of Arc," *American Historical Review* 107 (2002): 26–54.

⁵⁸ Aquinas, *ST* 1.84.7, 12:40–41.

⁵⁹ Ibid. 2-2.172.2, 45:54–57. He also observes that the *species* received by the senses are affected by some bodily transformation to impart certain meanings, as is demonstrated by sleepers and lunatics. In keeping with this prevailing view of images, John Nider will argue that phantasms are essential for spiritual revelation (*Formicarium* 2.7 [Douai, 1602], 143).

corporeal realities, devoid of all material existence, are only known through analogy with corporeal bodies.⁶⁰ This necessarily implies that our knowledge of divinity is mediated through corporeal images. When God manifests himself in a physical form, as he frequently did in the Hebrew Bible, this is the work of angels, who use certain forms to illuminate the human intellect.⁶¹ But the angelic role is itself oblique: in fact the immateriality of angels had become a point of dogma at the Fourth Lateran Council.⁶² Thus not only is God's appearance feigned, but the work of the agents entrusted with the act of representing him—whether simulating his appearance or manifesting themselves as his messengers—is riddled with a kind of deception.⁶³ It is in the context of parallel simulations that the miraculous transformation of the host is, as was seen earlier, most vulnerable to being compared with the tricks of magicians. In the case of angelic representations, however, the mechanisms employed are allegedly more transparent still. According to scholars such as Bonaventure and Aquinas, angels operate through temporarily assumed bodies, made out of the elements and fashioned into shapes of their own choosing.⁶⁴ But the very transparency of this process has the effect of surrounding it with an aura of deceit.

Of course evil angels (who were, in a certain sense freelancers, operating with divine permission but quasi-independently of the divine imprimatur), were invested with the same limitations and propensities and were likewise dependent on borrowed bodies. As Aquinas himself notes, demons, through their malevolent tricks, have the power to put shapes (*species*) in the imagination that seem to exist to the senses, but have no existence in external reality.⁶⁵ The new emphasis on the unlimited power of God in the later Middle Ages, an intellectual trend associated with William of Ockham (†1347), made it virtually impossible to withhold similar capabilities from God himself. Thus when the question presented itself as to whether or not God could make something appear to the senses that did not in fact exist, Ockham concedes this as a possibility—despite its ramifications for the integrity of God's dealing with humankind.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ Aquinas, *ST* 1.84.8 ad 3, 12:42–43.

⁶¹ Aquinas, *In II Sent.* 8.1.6, 2:217–18.

⁶² Regarding the significance of the unequivocal insistence on angelic disembodiment in this period, see Elliott, *Fallen Bodies*, 135–42.

⁶³ See Gregory, “La tromperie divine,” 187–88.

⁶⁴ See Elliott, *Fallen Bodies*, 132–44.

⁶⁵ Aquinas, *In II Sent.* 8.1.5, 2:215–16; see Gregory, “La tromperie divine,” 188–89.

⁶⁶ Ockham's answer is qualified by the fact that God cannot create an “evident cognition” of an absent thing, since such a cognition designates something which corresponds to reality in an empirical sense. But he does grant that “God can cause an act of believing through which I

Ockham himself had only treated the proposition of a God who could baffle through illusion in the course of a discussion on intuitive versus abstract knowledge.⁶⁷ But subsequent scholars would walk through the door opened by Ockham's inquiry, considering the problem of a deceptive God as a free-standing question and exploring its many disturbing implications.⁶⁸ Soon God's liberty would expand further to accommodate his potential for planting false thoughts in an individual's mind or even voluntarily willing someone to err.⁶⁹ Thus in an article devoted to proving that God was capable of deception, the English scholar Robert Holkot (†1349) would demonstrate how readily God's potential trickery in the material world invaded matters of faith. In the course of his argument, Robert cites innumerable instances of angelic deception, including the very employment of an assumed body.⁷⁰ By granting that good men and angels were frequently known to practice deception in the execution of a divine mandate, Robert took the logical next step of maintaining that anything that God could effect through intermediaries, he could naturally achieve independently.⁷¹

Even as the negative capabilities of the Creator seemed to expand under Robert, so did the usually generous scope of culpability associated with his creatures proportionately dwindle—a pattern that had disturbing consequences for possible Christological sightings. Thus when Robert asks expressly “whether one invincibly deluded by error in worshipping the devil transformed into an effigy of Christ is excused from idolatry by such ignorance,”⁷² the answer is a resolute affirmative. In fact, such an individual wins the same merit that would have been accorded had he or she been adoring

believe a thing to be present that is [in fact] absent. . . . And through such an act of faith a thing can appear to be present when it is absent; but this cannot happen through an evident act” (William of Ockham, *Quodl.* 5, q. 5 ad 1, trans. Alfred Freddoso and Francis Kelley, *Quodlibetal Questions*, 2 vols. [New Haven, 1993], 1:416).

⁶⁷ Joseph Owens, “Faith, Ideas, Illumination, and Experience,” in *The Cambridge History of Late Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, et. al (Cambridge, 1982), 457; John Boler, “Intuitive and Abstractive Cognition,” *ibid.*, 469–70. Boler, however, points out that the discussion itself is not explicitly linked with the possibility of God's absolute power.

⁶⁸ Gregory, “La tromperie divine,” 190; Genest, “Pierre de Ceffons et l'hypothèse du Dieu Trompeur,” in *Preuve et raisons*, ed. Kaluza and Vigneaux, 200–203. This problem was also bequeathed to the early modern period. See Tullio Gregory, “Dio ingannatore e genio maligno: nota in margine alle *Meditationes di Descartes*,” *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* 53 (1974): 477–516.

⁶⁹ Gregory, “La tromperie divine,” 190–92; Genest, “Pierre de Ceffons,” 200–203.

⁷⁰ Robert Holkot, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum quaestiones*, bk. 3, q. 1, art. 8 (Lyon, 1518; rpt. Frankfurt, 1967), BBB.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² “. . . an adorans diabolum transfiguratum in effigiem Christi per errorem invincibilem delusus, excusetur ab idolatria per talem ignorantiam” (*ibid.*, bk. 3, q. 1, art. 5, MM).

Christ himself. As proof, Robert adduces a hypothetical situation in which Peter and John, two good men, are both confronted by what is ostensibly the humanity of Christ. Peter's apparitional visitor turns out to be the genuine article. John, however, is not so fortunate. And yet Robert is prepared to credit John's intention of worshipping Christ.

That effigy by which the devil appears to John may be the humanity of Christ . . . if God permits it; and John believes that it is the humanity of Christ: and he adores him by genuflecting and kissing his feet; then according to that response it is necessary to concede that he adores the humanity of Christ. And thus one ought to concede that he touched the body of Christ in the sky.⁷³

In the course of describing the motions of worship, the above passage offers highly suggestive, albeit inflected, evidence that apparitions of Christ carried with them an expectation of genuine corporeality—at least for some. Robert then goes on to contend that it is in fact impossible to worship the devil with the kind of devotion owing to God: the deep reverence that Robert is invoking can only be evinced by God. In short, if John is construed as sinning through his error, Peter does likewise.

But Robert is only getting started. In the course of his discussion he will take up the banner of erroneous conscience, which even authorities such as Aquinas believed was binding in most circumstances, in order to advance his exculpation of John.⁷⁴ Thus John, believing as he did, would have committed a mortal sin had he *refused* to worship the visionary Christ. According to this criterion, the Jews would not be considered guilty for crucifying Christ; nor would an individual, similarly held in thrall by invincible error, be culpable for wishing to kill God. A gloss on 2 Corinthians 2 is introduced in support of this position: that when Satan transforms himself into an angel of light, he only deceives the bodily senses, without necessarily moving the mind from the true reason.⁷⁵ Robert winds up his lengthy *quaestio* with genuine éclat,

⁷³ "Preterea sit effigies illa qua diabolus appetet Joanni humanitas Christi . . . permittente deo, et credit Joannes quod sit humanitas Christi; et adoret eum genuflectendo et de osculando pedes, tunc secundum istam responsionem oportet concedere quod ipse adoret humanitatem Christi et sic debet concedere quod ipse tangeret corpus Christi in celo . . ." (*ibid.*). See Genest, "Pierre de Ceffons," 202.

⁷⁴ A number of masters believed that erroneous conscience was binding. Note that when Aquinas raises the question of whether adhering to a heretical belief can be a pious act of faith, however, he vigorously denies this as a possibility (*Quodlibet VI*, q. 4, art. 6). See Odon Lottin, *Psychologie et morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, vol. 2.1 (Louvain, 1948), 394–98, 400–406; and Xavier Colavechio, *Erroneous Conscience and Obligations: A Study of the Teaching from the "Summa Halesiana," Saint Bonaventure, Saint Albert the Great, and Thomas Aquinas* (Washington, D.C., 1961), 67–103.

⁷⁵ Holkot, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum quaestiones*, bk. 3, q. 1, art. 5, NN.

contending that, had Christ decided to set aside his humanity without telling the Virgin Mary, and she continued to worship him as before, she would likewise win merit through this misapprehension.⁷⁶

It is perhaps no accident that questions bearing on God's capacity to deceive, and other attendant questions developing around this central premise, first arose in the British Isles. The continent, which was much more seasoned in the culture of visions, visionaries, and heretical beliefs could not, in a sense, have afforded this line of speculation. When such intellectual strains did arrive, moreover, they were attended by vigorous efforts at suppression. There were at least two statutes issued by the University of Paris condemning Ockhamite thought—first in 1339 and then again in 1340.⁷⁷ Moreover, the articles extracted and condemned from the work of the Cistercian monk Jean de Mirecourt in 1347 by a university commission clearly indicate an Ockhamite-inflected line of questioning. Under the implied banner of God's absolute power, Jean's contentions pointed to how this power might manifest itself in a manner hitherto unimaginable: that Christ was able to have said and asserted a falsity both through a mental or vocal assertion (art. 2); that it is possible that Christ erred according to his created will and, according to his human side, perhaps proffered a lie (art. 3); that God could make someone sin and, because he requires this, it is pleasing to the divine will that this individual is a sinner (art. 10); that no one who sins in any way wishes or does otherwise than God wills him, so that when anyone sins, it is done with God's approval and he causes the person to sin (art. 12); that God causes evil and sin, while the sinner is willing and makes this sin occur (art. 14); that a sin is possessed of more good than bad (art. 15); that God is the cause of sin so that it is a sin, or the cause of the fault of evil so that it is evil, and the author of sin so that it is a sin (art. 34).⁷⁸ The university would likewise compel a certain

⁷⁶ Ibid. UU. Also see his next *quaestio* regarding whether someone is able to win merit through false faith, the answer to which is an unequivocal yes (bk. 3, q. 1, art. 6, UU–VV).

⁷⁷ See *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. Heinrich Denifle and Émile Chatelain, 4 vols. (Paris, 1888–97), 2:485–86, no. 123; 2:505–7, no. 1042; and see J. M. M. H. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris* (Philadelphia, 1998), 57–72. Also see William Courtenay, “The Registers of the University of Paris and the Statutes against Scientia Occamica,” *Vivarium* 1 (1991): 13–49, where the possibility of a lost statute is also raised. Note that academic heretics were generally disciplined by a commission of theological masters of the university. In the fourteenth century, however, we see the appointment of papal commissioners. Papal involvement tended to increase the number of scholars who were condemned. See idem, “Inquiry and Inquisition: Academic Freedom in Medieval Universities,” *Church History* 58 (1989): 174–77.

⁷⁸ *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* 2:610–14, no. 1147. There was an earlier preliminary list of some sixty-three errors, before it was narrowed down to a list of forty-one errors (see Denifle's discussion on 2:613, which explains discrepancies in the numbering). This

Augustinian friar named Gilles de Mantes to renounce his views in 1354. Fretting under his sense of God's capacity to predestine, Gilles had posited, among other things, that God can hinder an individual in the performance of a good act—a natural analogue to the views attributed to Jean de Mirecourt.⁷⁹ In his efforts to reform the University of Paris, Chancellor Jean Gerson was intent on closing down precisely this kind of speculation.⁸⁰ It comes as no surprise that in the course of his pastoral writings he stated categorically that anyone worshipping a Satanic Christ was unequivocally guilty of a mortal sin.⁸¹

But in spite of these vigorous efforts at suppression, the question of a deceptive deity nevertheless resurfaced under Pierre d'Ailly (†1420)—Gerson's friend, mentor, and immediate predecessor as chancellor. In the course of Pierre's exposition, he would accordingly affirm that an individual can win merit through a false judgment or even infidelity—a position that clearly corroborates Holcot's defense of those who would devoutly worship a false Christ.⁸²

shorter list was included in the *Collectio errorum* which was drawn up for the University of Paris. Jean wrote two defenses on his own behalf. See Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy*, 82–83; also Genest, "Pierre de Ceffons," 197–99. William Courtenay, however, sees Jean de Mirecourt's work as much more mainstream than is traditionally thought, arguing that Jean was, in fact, being condemned for his *subtilitas* and *aporia* as opposed to any particular doctrine. Courtenay points out that Jean's follower, Pierre de Ceffons, claims that the master was taken out of context, implying that there was more at stake than simple methodological issues—whether Jean really professed the views attributed to him or not ("John of Mirecourt and Gregory of Rimini on 'Whether God Can Undo the Past,'" *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 39 [1973]: 173; also see idem, "Erfurt CA 127 and the Censured Articles of Mirecourt and Autrecourt," in *Die Bibliotheca Amploniana: Ihre Bedeutung im Spannungsfeld von Aristotelismus, Nominalismus und Humanismus*, ed. Jan Aersten [Berlin, 1995], 341–45, for a discussion of the proceedings against Mirecourt).

⁷⁹ *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* 3:21–23, no. 1218, esp. art. 6 (p. 22). See Genest, "Pierre de Ceffons," 206–7.

⁸⁰ In his critique of current trends, Gerson singles out particularly discussions issuing from the concept of the absolute power of God (*Contra curiositatem studentium*, in *Oeuvres complètes* 3:231). On Gerson's suspicion of English scholarship, see Zénon Kaluza, "Gerson et les querelles doctrinales," in *Les querelles doctrinales à Paris: Nominalistes et Réalistes aux confins du XIV^e et du XV^e siècles* (Bergamo, 1988), 44; idem, "Les écoles doctrinales," *ibid.*, 13–14. On Gerson and reform, see Palémon Glorieux, "Le Chancelier Gerson et la réforme de l'enseignement," in *Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson* (Toronto, 1959), 285–98; Steven Ozment, "The University and the Church: Patterns of Reform in Jean Gerson," *Medievalia et Humanistica*, n.s., 1 (1970): 111–26, esp. 111–13; and James Connolly, *Jean Gerson: Reformer and Mystic* (Louvain, 1928), 71–89.

⁸¹ Jean Gerson, *De examinatione doctrinarum*, in *Oeuvres complètes* 9:464; cf. *Regulae mandatorum* 47, 9:106.

⁸² Pierre d'Ailly, *Quaestiones Magistri Petri de Alliaco Cardinalis Cameracensis super Primum Tertium et Quartum Sententiarum*, bk. 1, q. 12, art. 3, dubitatio 3 (Paris, 1505?), fol.

*
* *

An anecdote in a collection of the *exempla* of Jacques de Vitry maintains that Satan only appears to the very good or the very evil.⁸³ Clearly, the same could be said of Christ—whose appearances were largely reserved for saints or sinners. In the religious climate of the later Middle Ages, where the worst sinners were routinely transformed into the best saints, scholasticism looked beyond the patristic appearances of Satan appearing like Christ to a situation in which the presence of either could be possessed of the same meaning from the perspective of the viewer. If spiritual discernment failed you, and you fell victim to diabolical error, you could not just evade damnation, but even win merit, provided that your worship of either the real or the Satanic Christ was genuine. En route to this solution, authors such as Robert Holkot would eliminate the motives for persecuting Jews and heretics alike.

Cerebral as these speculations were, Robert's formulations as well as his solutions, were grounded in the corporeal spirituality of the later Middle Ages in which bleeding hosts, apparitions of Christ, and the palpable ministrations of God's angelic messengers seemingly abounded. But scholastic efforts to comprehend the interpenetration of the natural by the supernatural world ultimately generated a maelstrom of uncertainty that was not easily dissipated. Despite copious disavowals, scholastic theologians had arrived at a place where celestial visions and miracles were rooted in a kind of divine deception that found its most compelling analogue in the tricks of magicians. The divine author of this prestidigitation had much in common with the dark Lord of Jean de Mirecourt or Gilles de Mantes: one who would compel an individual to sin, although the person in question all the while believed that he or she was acting meritoriously. Surely such a God would be capable of compelling the worship of the Satanic Christ.

But as is clear in the cases of both Jean de Mirecourt and Gilles de Mantes, such speculations were summarily condemned by the University of Paris, which would show repeatedly in the course of the fifteenth century that the exercise of discerning between Christ and Satan, as difficult as such a task might prove, still mattered to them very much. Their most famous instance of institutional discernment contributed to the inquisitional verdict condemning

190r. D'Ailly is clearly familiar with Holkot, summarizing his chief points in detail (*ibid.*, fol. 187r).

⁸³ J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1910), 3:5, no. 4; from Harley 463, fol. 1v. Herbert notes that this *exemplum* is not included in Frederick Crane's edition of *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry*, Folk-Lore Society Publications 26 (London, 1878).

Jeanne d'Arc.⁸⁴ But a less celebrated Parisian trial seems especially germane to the focus of this study. In September 1430, eight months before Jeanne's execution, a certain Breton woman, Pieronne, was examined by the university and subsequently executed. The anonymous journal of a Parisian bourgeois details her offense as follows:

She admitted that she had received the precious body of Our Lord twice in one day. She affirmed and swore that God often appeared to her in human form and talked to her as one friend does to another; that the last time she had seen him he was wearing a long white robe and red tunic underneath, which is blasphemous. She would not take back her assertion that she frequently saw God dressed like this and so was this day condemned to be burned, which she was, and died this Sunday maintaining her belief.⁸⁵

Pieronne's "error" seems trifling. Apart from overindulgence in women's characteristic eucharistic frenzy—which would seem to be more the fault of the celebrant, the popular preacher Brother Richard, than her own—it consisted largely in reversing the traditional colours of Christ's garments.⁸⁶ And yet, in a culture of corporeal imaginings where everyone knew what Christ looked like and how he dressed, one did not, presumably, need the spiritual gift of discernment to recognize the true diabolical identity of Pieronne's visitor. Pieronne died because of the depth of her investment in the body of Christ in its different guises. Her judges condemned her because of theirs.

Indiana University.

⁸⁴ See Elliott, "Seeing Double."

⁸⁵ *A Parisian Journal, 1405–1449*, trans. Janet Shirley (Oxford, 1968), 254. Pieronne was a follower of Brother Richard and, like Richard, also endorsed Jeanne d'Arc's mission. Another woman was arrested at the same time as Pieronne, but afterwards released. Note that a sermon preached by the Dominican inquisitor after Jeanne d'Arc's execution lumps Jeanne, Pieronne, and Catherine La Rochelle (a visionary whose suspect visions were exposed by Jeanne herself) together. According to this sermon, Brother Richard had administered the Eucharist three time in one day to Jeanne, and twice to Pieronne (265). See also Henry Charles Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1888), 3:376. For a parallel indictment of excessively frequent communion, this time resulting in antinomian excesses and seduction, see Nider's *Formicarium* 3.6, pp. 218–20.

⁸⁶ On brother Richard's impact, see *A Parisian Journal, 1405–1449*, a. 1429, trans. Shirley, 230–35.

KINGS, BISHOPS, AND POLITICAL ETHICS: BRUNO OF SEGNI ON THE CARDINAL VIRTUES*

István Bejczy

BOOTH as a political figure and as a scholar, Bruno of Segni (ca. 1040/50–1123; canonized 1181/83; also called Bruno of Asti after his presumed birthplace) lived in the shadow of the great. His writings, consisting mostly of exegetical works and theological treatises, are nowadays considered notable and even outstanding for their didactic qualities. But Bruno is regarded neither as a profound mystical writer nor as an intellectual comparable to Anselm of Canterbury, with whom he was probably acquainted and shared some authorial devices. As for his public activities, Bruno occupied a leading position in the Italian church as bishop of Segni (from 1079/80) and abbot of Monte-cassino (1107–1111/12). He closely collaborated with several popes during the Investiture Contest, composing a number of pamphlets against royal interference with episcopal rule, and there is evidence that he was elevated to the rank of cardinal, but he certainly did not dictate papal policy. After his sharp public protest against the Concordat of Sutri (1111), which in his opinion conceded too much to the imperial party, Pope Pascal II even made him give up his abbacy and withdraw to his bishopric for the rest of his life.¹

All this does not mean that Bruno is a figure of merely secondary interest. His writings may not have ushered in the age of scholasticism, especially

* This article results from the research programme “A Genealogy of Morals: The Cardinal Virtues in Medieval Discourse, 500–1500,” cosponsored by the Netherlands Organisation of Scientific Research (NWO) and the Catholic University of Nijmegen and directed by the present author.

¹ For Bruno’s biography, see Bernhard Gigalski, *Bruno, Bischof von Segni, Abt von Monte-Cassino (1049–1123): Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Münster, 1898); and Réginald Grégoire, *Bruno de Segni: Exégète médiéval et théologien monastique* (Spoleto, 1965). Bruno’s characteristics as an author and scholar are best described by Gillian R. Evans, “St. Anselm and St. Bruno of Segni: The Common Ground,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 29 (1978): 129–44. On the question of Bruno’s cardinalate, cf. Hans-Walter Klewitz, “Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums” (1936), reprinted in his *Reformpapsttum und Kardinalkolleg* (Darmstadt, 1957), 37–39; and Grégoire, *Bruno de Segni*, 33–34 n. 86; see also Edith Pásztor, “Per la storia del cardinalato nel secolo XI: gli elettori di Urbano II,” in *Società, istituzioni, spiritualità. Studi in onore di Cinzio Vilante*, ed. Girolamo Arnaldi et al., 2 vols. (Spoleto, 1994), 2:581–98.

since he refused a dialectical approach to religious issues, but they are of interest when seen in relation to his public career. It is at the crossroads of his intellectual and political activities that Bruno's originality appears. It has been demonstrated, for example, that his commentaries on the Old Testament reflect the polemical themes of the Investiture Contest and thus constitute a prime example of "political allegory" in high medieval exegesis.²

This article concentrates on one particular politically relevant theme in Bruno's writings: his treatment of the cardinal virtues. We shall compare Bruno's views with those of other authors living in or shortly before his century and try to relate his personal insights to his political ideas. It will be seen that the cardinal virtues in Bruno's writings function as ingredients of a political ethic that puts his opinions on the relation of secular and ecclesiastical power into a revealing perspective.

I

The cardinal virtues (*prudentia, iustitia, fortitudo, temperantia*) originated with Plato and found a wide diffusion in the ethical systems of the ancient world. Apart from a reference in the Old Testament at Wisdom 8:7, they made their way into Christian thought mainly through the writings of Latin Stoic authors: Cicero, Seneca and, to a lesser extent, Macrobius. For these authors, the virtues were natural attitudes to be developed and put into practice by the wise, notably by men carrying public responsibilities. Attempts to Christianize the virtues existed from patristic times. Polemicizing against Cicero, Ambrose of Milan introduced the concepts in the theology of Latin Christendom and moreover coined the term "cardinal virtues." Other Fathers also took pains to invest the virtues with a Christian meaning. Augustine of Hippo considered the four virtues as specimens of *caritas*, the central virtue implanted into the human being not by nature but by God. Pope Gregory the Great was to exercise even greater influence in the field of medieval moral thought. Although *humilitas* constituted for Gregory the root of all morality, he treated the four virtues as the chief moral guidelines of the active life (notably in his *Moralia* and in his homilies on Ezekiel), whereas the theological virtues

² I. S. Robinson, " 'Political Allegory' in the Biblical Exegesis of Bruno of Segni," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 50 (1983): 69–98. For a general discussion of "political allegory" in the high Middle Ages, see Beryl Smalley, *The Becket Conflict and the Schools: A Study of Intellectuals in Politics* (Oxford, 1973), 31–36; see also Philippe Buc, *L'ambiguité du Livre: Prince, pouvoir et peuple dans les commentaires de la Bible au moyen âge* (Paris, 1994).

(faith, hope, and charity) rather pertained to the celestial destination of human beings.³

In the early Middle Ages, the cardinal virtues became a fixed ingredient of Christian morality. Many authors, following the examples of the Fathers, simply treated the virtues as if they were Christian concepts. The virtues regularly occurred even in purely Christian genres such as exegesis and hagiography; apparently, their non-Christian origins were all but completely forgotten. Only Bishop Martin of Braga's *Formula vitae honestae* (ca. 570/79), dedicated to King Miro of Suevia, presented the virtues in a Stoic manner, as constituents of an aristocratic *honestas* rather than Christian morality.⁴ Still, in Carolingian times the virtues often appeared in moral treatises addressed to secular rulers (Alcuin, *Liber de vitiis et virtutibus*; Hrabanus Maurus, *De anima*) as well as in artistic representations of kingship,⁵ in accordance with the connection of the cardinal virtues to the active life but perhaps owing a debt to Stoic antecedents as well.

After about 900, the use of the cardinal virtues in the context of secular power seems to have diminished.⁶ The virtues still regularly appeared in Bible commentaries and pastoral writings, mostly in a cursory way; few if any authors devoted sustained discussions to the cardinal virtues as political concepts or as moral principles in general. In the eleventh century, the virtues

³ For a survey of patristic thought on the virtues and its influence in the early Middle Ages, see Sibylle Mähl, *Quadriga virtutum: Die Kardinaltugenden in der Geistesgeschichte der Karolingerzeit* (Cologne, 1969). Marcia L. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages II: Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought through the Sixth Century* (Leiden, 1985), discusses the Latin Fathers up to Martin of Braga with much attention to their moral thought. For Ambrose in particular, see Maria Becker, *XΡΗΣΙΣ/Chrēsis: Die Methode der Kirchenväter im Umgang mit der antiken Kultur*, vol. 4: *Die Kardinaltugenden bei Cicero und Ambrosius: De officiis* (Basel, 1994). See also Richard Newhauser, *The Treatise on Vices and Virtues in Latin and the Vernacular*, *Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental* 68 (Turnhout, 1993).

⁴ *Martini episcopi Bracarensis opera omnia*, ed. Claude W. Barlow (New Haven, 1950), 204–50.

⁵ See Mähl, *Quadriga virtutum*, 83–160 (treatises), 171–76 (iconography); for iconography, see also Michaela Bautz, *Virtutes: Studien zu Funktion und Ikonographie der Tugenden im Mittelalter und im 16. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1999), 56–59. Alcuin composed his *Liber de vitiis et virtutibus* (ca. 800) for Wido, margrave of Brittany. For the complete text, see PL 101:613–38; for manuscripts, partial editions, and a bibliography, see *Clavis scriptorum latinorum mediæ aevi: Auctores Galliae, 735–987*, vol. 2: *Alcuinus*, ed. Marie-Hélène Jullien and Françoise Perelman (Turnhout, 1999), 153–59. Hrabanus Maurus dedicated *De anima* (855/56), PL 110:1109–20, to Lotharius II, ruler of the Frankish Middle Kingdom; one third of the work deals with the cardinal virtues.

⁶ An example of a tenth-century text which briefly expounds the virtues in the context of royal education is Ratherius of Verona, *Praelogia* 3.5–6, ed. P. L. D. Reid, CCCM 46A (Turnhout, 1984), 80–81. For the iconographic tradition, see Bautz, *Virtutes*.

mainly occurred (when occurring at all) in writings of Benedictine authors. Typical for those authors is the complete and apparently self-evident assimilation of the virtues to Christian ethics. Significantly, the one or two (possibly) eleventh-century moral texts based on Martin of Braga's *Formula* apply the statements of the Iberian bishop to monastic life in particular.⁷ An even more striking example is the *vita* of Odilo of Cluny, written by his pupil Iotsaldus in 1051/52, the first saint's life to adopt the virtues as structuring principles in the description of the saint's morality⁸ (thus inaugurating a tradition that grew dominant in modern times and found recognition in canon law until 1983⁹). The majority of the observations of the eleventh-century authors do not reflect any awareness of the pagan provenance of the virtues; to the contrary, some of their remarks suggest that the virtues were genuine biblical concepts.¹⁰ When we study Bruno's thought, the predominantly Benedictine tradition of spiritually interpreting the cardinal virtues obviously constitutes our first point of reference.

In the early twelfth century, the situation changed dramatically.¹¹ Authors from outside the Benedictine order, many of them secular clerics residing in episcopal cities, rediscovered the ancient roots of the cardinal virtues and developed a moral philosophy in which the relation of the virtues to Christian thought was no longer taken for granted and became the object of critical reflection. Notably Hugh of Saint Victor (ca. 1096–1141) and Peter Abelard

⁷ The first example is Bruges, Stadsbibliotheek 99 (s. xi), fol. 61v, a short, anonymous text addressed to an audience bound by a “communis regula.” It is identical to item no. 2898 in Morton W. Bloomfield et al., *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100–1500 AD* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), which only mentions Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana S. Croce Plut. XXXII dext. 5, fol. 141. The other example is Marbod of Rennes (1035–1123), Ep. 5, PL 171:1479C–1480C. Marbod, a secular cleric who became bishop of Rennes in 1096, wrote his letter to a nun called Argénor.

⁸ See Iotsaldus, *Vita Odilonis* 1.5 (prudence), 6 (justice), 11–12 (*fortitudo*), 13 (temperance), ed. Johannes Staub, MGH SS Rerum Germanicarum 68 (Hannover, 1999), 154–57, 167–71.

⁹ See *Corpus iuris canonici* [1917], *Acta apostolicae sedis* 9.2 (1917), canon 2104: “In causis confessorum discuti debet dubium: an constet de virtutibus theologia libus Fide, Spe, Caritate tum in Deum tum in proximum, necnon de cardinalibus Prudentia, Iustitia, Temperantia, Fortitudine, earumque adnexis in gradu heroico in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.” The current *Corpus iuris canonici* [1983], *Acta apostolicae sedis* 75.2 (1983), does not contain any such precise criteria of holiness.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Peter Damian, Ep. 23, ed. Kurt Reindel, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, 4 vols., MGH, *Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit IV.1–4* (Munich, 1983–93), 1:219: “quattuor virtutes, quas scriptura sacra nominat principales.”

¹¹ For medieval treatises on virtues and vices from 1100, see Bloomfield et al., *Incipits*, to be updated by Richard G. Newhauser and István Bejczy, “Towards a Revised Incipitarium: A Preliminary List of Additions, Corrections, and Deletions to Update Morton Bloomfield et al., *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices*” (forthcoming).

(1079–1142) tried to save the Christian character of morality by taking recourse to Augustine's view that virtue resulted from charity;¹² Peter Lombard, however, would recognize the natural goodness of unbelievers in his *Sententiae* (ca. 1160).¹³ Certain texts, such as the widely read *Moralium dogma philosophorum* (ca. 1150?), even lacked a Christian point of view altogether.¹⁴ Some Benedictines writing in the early twelfth century seem to have reacted against this new development. Rupert of Deutz (ca. 1076–1129) repeatedly stated that the philosophers of the ancient world merely knew the names of the four virtues, but not their true, Christian meaning.¹⁵ Once he went so far as to state that *iustitia, prudentia, temperantia*, and *fortitudo* were merely pagan names for the virtues which Christians knew respectively as *fides, spes, caritas*, and the perseverance in these three virtues.¹⁶ Bruno of Segni's writings suggest that he likewise tried to save the Christian character of the cardinal virtues against the new philosophical currents of his time.

Bruno's most important presentation of the cardinal virtues is found in book 2, chap. 4 of his *Sententiae*, a work mainly consisting of sermons with Bruno's ecclesiology as a principal theme.¹⁷ Its usual title in medieval manu-

¹² See, e.g., Hugh of Saint Victor, *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris* 1, PL 175:9D–10A: “Ethicam quoque scripserunt gentilium philosophi, in qua quasi membra quaedam virtutum de corpore bonitatis truncata pinxerunt, sed membra virtutum viva esse non possunt sine corpore charitatis Dei. Omnes virtutes unum corpus faciunt; cuius corporis caput charitas est”; and Peter Abelard, *Collationes* 2.100, ed. and trans. John Marenbon and Giovanni Orlandi (Oxford, 2001), 118: “si proprie uirtus intelligatur, que uidelicet meritum apud Deum optinet, sola charitas uirtus appellanda est, que quidem, pro eo quod iustum efficit uel fortis seu temperantem, iustitia recte dicitur uel fortitudo siue temperantia.”

¹³ Peter Lombard, *II Sent.* 41.2, Spicilegium bonaventurianum 4–5 (Quaracchi, 1971–81), 1:564: “si quis Iudeus uel malus Christianus necessitatem proximi releuauerit naturali pietate ductus, bonum fecit, et bona fuit uoluntas qua illud fecit.”

¹⁴ According to Philippe Delhaye, “Une adaptation du *De officiis* au XII^e siècle: Le *Moralium dogma philosophorum*,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 16 (1949): 227–58 at 234, only thirteen out of its 517 citations stem from biblical or Christian sources. For a summary of the debate on the work's date and authorship, see John R. Williams, “The Quest for the Author of the *Moralium Dogma Philosophorum*, 1931–1956,” *Speculum* 32 (1957): 736–47. Since 1957, no new elements have been added to the debate.

¹⁵ Rupert of Deutz, *De sancta Trinitate* 24 (in libros Regum 3.20), ed. H. Haacke, CCCM 22 (Turnhout, 1972), 1322; *De gloria et honore filii hominis super Mattheum* 4 and 5, ed. Haacke, CCCM 29 (Turnhout, 1979), 123 and 149.

¹⁶ Rupert of Deutz, *De sancta Trinitate* 15 (in Leviticum 2.2), ed. Haacke, 856.

¹⁷ Grégoire, *Bruno de Segni*, 95, characterizes the work with good reason as “six livres de sermons, qui constituent une ébauche de traité de l'Eglise”; see also, on book 2 in particular, p. 96 n. 66: “Le livre 2 semble être effectivement constitué d'authentiques sermons dont ils conservent certains procédés: application morale finale, style direct, allusions concrètes à des moines.” Evans, “St. Anselm and St. Bruno,” 132, seems to recognize the homiletic character of Bruno's work only from book 3 onwards; the characteristics listed by Grégoire apply, how-

scripts is *De laudibus ecclesiae*. It is not clear when exactly Bruno composed his *Sententiae*. A number of chapters/sermons, including the one on the cardinal virtues, contain references to Benedict of Nursia and to monastic life. Réginald Grégoire therefore considered the year 1107, when Bruno became abbot of Montecassino, as *terminus post quem* of the work. This seems plausible enough, but Grégoire dated three manuscripts which have the *Sententiae* to the eleventh century, without noticing the inconsistency of his statements.¹⁸ Two of these manuscripts contain our chapter, as a personal enquiry has made apparent; one of them certainly includes the reference to Benedict.¹⁹ If these manuscripts really date from the eleventh century, one might conjecture that Bruno mentioned Benedict to a monastic audience without being one of its members. Given Bruno's role in consecrating altars around Rome and beyond, early sermons suited to a monastic audience would not come unexpected. In sum, we cannot date with certainty Bruno's chapter on the cardinal virtues (which in at least one case was independently transmitted²⁰); however, the chapter must have been written after Bruno finished his commentary on Exodus, for it refers back to that work.

Bruno's commentary on Exodus likewise discusses the cardinal virtues—notably by connecting them to *hyacinthus*, *purpura*, *coccus*, and *byssus*, the four colours which constantly recur in the description of the tabernacle, the vestments of Aaron, etc.²¹—and it will therefore receive attention in this

ever, to book 2, chap. 4. Bruno's writings are edited for the most part in PL 164 and 165; the *Sententiae* are in PL 165:875–1078.

¹⁸ Grégoire, *Bruno de Segni*, 49 (date of composition), 95–101 (list of manuscripts, to which the following may be added: Vatican City, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 994, fols. 1r–118r, and Vat. lat. 8908). The three manuscripts dated to the eleventh century are Cava, Abbazia della S. Trinità 6, fols. 87r–176v, New York, Pierpont Morgan Library G.51 (s. xi–xii), fols. 55v–156r, and Rome, Biblioteca Angelica 362 (D 1.8).

¹⁹ The New York manuscript only contains fragments of books 1 and 6. The manuscript in Rome includes book 2, chap. 4 at fols. 35v–39v (I owe this information to Armida Batori, Director of the Biblioteca Angelica); I do not know whether this manuscript contains the reference to Benedict. The Cava manuscript has book 2, chap. 4 at fol. 104r–105v with the reference to Benedict appearing at fol. 104v (I owe this information to D. Leone Morinelli, O.S.B., librarian of the abbey).

²⁰ Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale e Universitaria 574 (D.VI.21) (s. xiii), fols. 2r–5v; see Grégoire, *Bruno de Segni*, 100.

²¹ The discussion of the colours in the *Expositio in Exodum* begins at PL 164:306A; for parallels, see *Sententiae* 2.4 (PL 165:915B) and 6.2, *De confessoribus sermo* 7 (1066B–D). Although patristic and medieval exegetes associated the cardinal virtues with all sorts of biblical fours, Bruno seems to have been the first to establish the connection with the four colours. In the traditional moral interpretation of the colours, *hyacinthus* rather referred to the love for heavenly things, *coccus* to charity, and *byssus* to chastity; *purpura* was associated with justice and government but also with courage and martyrdom. See Gregory the Great, *Registrum epistolarum* 1.24, ed. D. Norberg, CCL 140 (Turnhout, 1982), 25; Bede, *De tabernaculo*, ed. D.

article as well. The discussion in that work leads to the exposition in the *Sententiae*, although it is less systematic and differs in some important aspects from Bruno's later treatment. We will therefore use the commentary on Exodus as comparative material, along with the few isolated references to the virtues in Bruno's other works.²²

II

The first book of Bruno's *Sententiae* is called "De figuris Ecclesiae" and discusses some biblical images, mainly taken from the Old Testament, which in Bruno's conception stand for the Church (Paradise, the Temple of Solomon, etc.). The title of the second book is "De ornamentis Ecclesiae." It presents the virtues as the adornments of the Church, starting with the three theological virtues, *fides*, *spes*, and *caritas*, which receive one chapter each. The fourth chapter is on the cardinal virtues (a term which Bruno never employed; his usual designation is *virtutes principales*, a phrase applied by the vast majority of his contemporaries). The fifth to eleventh chapters are concerned with humility, mercy, peace, patience, chastity, obedience and abstinence. Bruno does not present these seven virtues as the counterparts of the seven deadly sins, but one may take it for granted that he composed his list in view of these. The accepted name for the virtues opposing the deadly sins is remedial virtues, and we will call them by that name in this article. The twelfth and final chapter of the second book offers a summary and a conclusion. Bruno's devoting a separate chapter to the four virtues is in itself an indication of the originality of his thought: Bruno is among the first authors since Carolingian times to engage in systematic reflection on the cardinal virtues. Mentioning the cardinal virtues together with the theological and other virtues was not uncommon in the eleventh century,²³ but this century does not offer any parallel for Bruno's collective and detailed discussion of

Hurst, CCL 119A (Turnhout, 1969), 1–139. Hugh of Saint-Victor would connect the colours with the cardinal virtues in *De sacramentis* 2.4.3, PL 176:434C.

²² I will concentrate on those passages in which the four virtues appear together. When *prudentia*, *iustitia*, *fortitudo*, and *temperantia* appear separately in medieval texts, they are not necessarily meant to be cardinal virtues. Most medieval authors discussed the four virtues together, and Bruno even insisted on their necessary connection, as will be shown in this article.

²³ See, e.g., Jean de Fécamp (ca. 990–1078), *Meditatio* 18, PL 158:799A (among the works of Anselm of Canterbury); Odilo of Cluny, *Sermo* 9, PL 142:1018D; Peter Damian, Ep. 31 (=Liber gomorrhianus), ed. Riedel, 1:310, and Ep. 158, ed. Riedel, 4:87–88; Guibert of Nogent, *Moralia in Genesin* 10 (49:28), PL 156:330B–C. For earlier examples, see, e.g., Augustine, Ep. 171A, ed. A. Goldbacher, CSEL 44 (Vienna, 1904), 635; and Bede, *De tabernaculo* 3, ed. Hurst, 104.

those virtues. Moreover, Bruno's hierarchy of the different sets of virtues is striking. Following Gregory the Great, most authors of the eleventh century considered humility the foundation of virtue. In Bruno's presentation, humility is only one of the remedial virtues, recommendable but not advocated as essential, whereas the cardinal virtues are absolutely indispensable.²⁴

The opening sentence of Bruno's chapter expresses the essence of his view on the cardinal virtues: "Quatuor sunt virtutes, quibus totus regitur mundus, ita sibi conjunctae, ut sine se esse non valeant."²⁵ The formula seems to allude to the famous letter of Pope Gelasius I to Emperor Anastasius I (494): "Duo sunt . . . quibus principaliter mundus hic regitur, auctoritas sacra pontificum et regalis potestas."²⁶ Two aspects of Bruno's formula call for attention. First, the cardinal virtues together cover the whole range of earthly life. Second, there exists a necessary connection between the four virtues. Both were ancient ideas which hardly found any support in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Bruno picks up on these ideas and elaborates on them in the remainder of his chapter in a particularly clear and thoughtful way.

As for the ground covered by the cardinal virtues, Bruno's formula "quibus totus regitur mundus" indicates that for him the virtues relate to this world, much in line with the idea of Gregory the Great that the cardinal virtues determined the active life. Actually, Bruno is thinking of politics in particular. In his discussion of prudence, which he seems to consider the most important of the four virtues (agreeing in this respect with some but not all Benedictine

²⁴ See *Sententiae* 2.4, PL 165:911D: "Talis est sapientia inter alias virtutes, quale est aurum inter omnia metalla"; 912A: "Tolle justitiam, et perit mundus"; 912C: "sine qua [sc. fortitudine] et sapientia et justitia inutiles esse videntur"; and 913A: "mundus ipse sine ea [sc. temperantia] stare non possit.". Such statements are absent in Bruno's chapters on humility and the other remedial virtues. Bruno often mentions humility as one virtue among many; in two passages, humility follows after the theological and the cardinal virtues (*Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:319B; *Sententiae* 4.8, Sermo 2 de ramis palmarum, PL 165:999C–D), whereas the reverse order never occurs in his work. The only passage where Bruno gives humility a privileged position among the virtues is *Commentaria in Lucam* 2, PL 165:432C (=Homilia 98, PL 165:826D): "Radix omnium malorum superbia: custos virtutum humilitas est." For humility as *custos virtutum* see, e.g., Bede, *In Ezram et Neemiam* 3, ed. D. Hurst, CCL 119A (Turnhout, 1969), 348; Paschasius Radbertus, *De fide, spe et charitate* 1.12, ed. B. Paulus, CCCM 97 (Turnhout, 1990), 49; and Bruno the Carthusian, *Expositio in Psalmos*, PL 152:1306B. For *superbia* as *radix malorum*, see Augustine, *In Iohannis epistulam ad Parthos* 8, PL 35:2039. The idea that vices originate from pride and virtues from humility owed its popularity to Gregory the Great.

²⁵ *Sententiae* 2.4, PL 165:911B. See also *Sententiae* 6.2, De confessoribus sermo 7, 1066B: "His quatuor virtutibus regitur mundus quae inter se conjunctae sunt, ut una sine reliquis esse non valeat."

²⁶ Gelasius, Ep. 8, ed. Eduard Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* (Munich, 1934), 20.

predecessors),²⁷ he asks rhetorically who could govern (*regere vel gubernare*) a kingdom, a province, an estate, a family or himself without it. In a similar vein, he calls justice the virtue on behalf of which emperors, kings and other rulers exist. And in the conclusion of his introductory remarks on the four virtues, Bruno observes that he has sufficiently demonstrated their necessity “for all humans and first of all for the powerful to whom the government of the world has been entrusted.”²⁸ Bruno, then, is not only one of the first authors since Carolingian times to present a systematic discussion of the virtues, but also to conceive of the virtues as *Herrschertugenden*, as the chief moral guidelines of princely rule. In a way, Bruno anticipates the scholastic authors of the thirteenth century who characterized the cardinal virtues as *virtutes politicae*. The only other contemporary author who connected the four virtues to royal government was Hugh of Fleury (†1118/35), in his treatise *De regia potestate*, written after 1102 for King Henry I of England.²⁹ Bruno’s “*De ornamentis ecclesiae*” may date from the late eleventh century and thus be older, but the question of priority must remain open until we know when Bruno composed his work.

Continuing his exposition, Bruno even enters the sphere of political education. All four virtues are indispensable, argues Bruno, something which may lead to embarrassment on the part of those who want to become virtuous beings: how should one fully develop one’s moral consciousness in four different domains at the same time? The necessary connection of the cardinal virtues provides a solution: one may begin to apply one virtue and be confident that the others will automatically follow. “Make sure then, O prince, whoever you are, that you possess and maintain justice,” continues Bruno, using the second person for the first time in his chapter, “for this seems to be the virtue you need most, and by practicing it you will soon appear to all men as wise, strong and moderate as well.”³⁰ Bruno’s directly addressing an audience of

²⁷ See *Sententiae* 6.2, *De confessoribus sermo* 7, PL 165:1066B: “Ipsa enim caeteris virtutibus altior est.” Obviously, Bruno’s idea that one virtue cannot be present without the three others renders the question of their hierarchy largely irrelevant. Prudence is considered the most important cardinal virtue by, e.g., Hugues of Flavigny, *Chronicon* 1, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS 8 (Hannover, 1848), 294 (“virtutum principalium prima”). According to other authors, justice came first; see, e.g., Odilo of Cluny, *Vita Maioli*, PL 142:952D: “justitiam vero, quae per omnia genera virtutum diffunditur et earumdem virtutum conditum esse videtur.”

²⁸ *Sententiae* 2.4, PL 165:912A (prudence), 912C (justice), 913C (“omnibus . . . maxime que potentibus, quibus mundi regimina credita sunt”).

²⁹ Hugh of Fleury, *Tractatus de regia potestate et sacerdotali dignitate* 1.6, ed. E. Sackur, MGH Libelli de lite 2 (Hannover, 1892), 473.

³⁰ *Sententiae* 2.4, PL 165:913D: “Fac ergo, o princeps, quicunque es, ut justitiam habeas et teneas. Haec enim tibi magis necessaria esse videtur, et mox per hanc unam et sapiens, et fortis et bene moderatus omnibus apparebis.”

anonymous rulers and his outspoken didactic concern remind one of the genre of mirrors of princes. The remainder of his argument, mainly consisting of examples, can indeed be regarded as a piece of princely instruction. His choice of justice as the preeminent virtue of rulers is traditional and recurs often in his writings,³¹ but his use of this choice to develop an educational policy is a remarkable personal contribution.

The necessary connection of the cardinal virtues is a Stoic idea. Bruno is not the first Christian author to subscribe to it,³² but he is the only one in the eleventh century; moreover, Bruno is probably the first Christian to make the connection a cornerstone of his ethics. In his commentary on Exodus, he already argues that the cardinal virtues are useless (*inutiles, vanae, stultae*) as long as one does not possess the four of them. By way of negative examples, Bruno advances three characters from the Old Testament: Salomon's wisdom was of no avail as he lacked the courage to abstain from sexual indulgence, Ozias (Azariah, Uzziah) was a just but intemperate king and hence was killed by his enemies, Samson showed great courage but little wisdom and thus courted disaster.³³ In the *Sententiae*, Bruno takes a more radical stand: those who have one virtue, have them all; those who lack one virtue, have none of them.³⁴ Possessing one virtue without having the others is therefore a situation which cannot even exist. The examples which Bruno sets to secular rulers in his chapter all illustrate this idea. First, he points to several Old Testament characters who gave proof of one virtue in particular and hence possessed all four: Abraham and the three young men condemned to fire by Nebuchadnezzar (*iustitia*), the patriarch Joseph (*fortitudo*), and Daniel (*sapientia/prud-*

³¹ See *Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:307A; and *Sententiae* 6.2, De confessoribus sermo 7, PL 165:1066C. “iustitia ad reges pertinet.” Cf. Isidore of Sevilla, *Etymologiae* 9.3.5, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911): “Regiae uirtutes praecipuae duae: iustitia et pietas,” a phrase quoted, e.g., by Berthold of Reichenau (†1088), *Annales*, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS 5 (Hannover, 1844), 297; see also Walram of Naumburg (†1111), Ep. (to Count Louis II of Thuringia), ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Libelli de lite 2 (Hannover, 1892), 286: “Omni regno utilis est concordia, desiderabilis est iustitia. Haec enim virtus mater est probitatis et conservatrix totius honestatis.” Buc, *L'ambiguité du Livre*, 177–79, discusses the contrast between coercive *iustitia* and merciful *misericordia* in early and high medieval political thought, observing that coercive *iustitia* was thought to be the chief ingredient of secular power in particular.

³² See, e.g., Ambrose, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* 5.63, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 14 (Turnhout, 1957), 157, quoted in the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Bible at Luke 6:20, see *Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria*, 4 vols. (Strasbourg 1480–1481, rpt. Turnhout, 1992), 4:162; Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 21.3.6, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 143A (Turnhout, 1985), 1068; and Hrabanus Maurus, *De anima*, PL 110:1115D.

³³ *Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:307C–D. As for Ozias, Bruno is not exactly correct: according to 2 Chronicles 26, Ozias was struck with leper upon which he gave up government and lived an isolated life in his palace.

³⁴ *Sententiae* 2.4, PL 165:911C.

tia). Next, he mentions two Old Testament kings who lost all four virtues because they gave up one of them: David, whose *fortitudo* was overcome by lust for Bathsheba, and again Salomon, who abandoned wisdom by worshipping idols.³⁵ Finally, Bruno emphasizes that the best examples of a perfect harmony of the four virtues are offered by the apostles, the martyrs, the confessors and the doctors of the Church, who have the bishops and priests as their successors. Turning to the latter category, Bruno warns them not to stray from the path of virtue and orthodoxy. He concludes his chapter with a eulogy of the cardinal virtues, heavily influenced by the imagery of his commentary on Exodus.

Bruno's view of the cardinal virtues as *virtutes politicae* avant-la-lettre does certainly not imply that he interpreted them as secular concepts. In accordance with contemporary Benedictine authors, Bruno assimilates the virtues to Christian doctrine as much as possible. Apart from one reference to Benedict and a tacit citation from Augustine, his exposition in the *Sententiae* only contains quotations from the Bible, not from the classical authors to whom Western Christendom owed the concept of the virtues. True enough, Bruno hardly ever quoted his sources on any occasion,³⁶ but the exposition in the *Sententiae* does not seem to contain any allusion whatsoever to the classics. It seems plausible that Bruno consciously avoided using pagan sources, being concerned to give the virtues a Christian meaning and constantly referring in all of his writings to "philosophers, heretics and Jews" as enemies of the faith.³⁷ His rather brief definitions of the virtues are all religiously inspired and accord rather well in this respect with his commentary on Exodus. Equating *prudentia* with *sapientia*, as many Christian authors had done before him,³⁸ Bruno emphasizes that he is speaking of the divinely inspired wisdom preached by the apostles and the Fathers rather than the wisdom of philosophers and orators, which is folly in God's sight.³⁹ Many Benedictines of Bruno's generation subscribed to a similar conception of prudence, sometimes alluding to the distinction between *prudentia carnis* and *prudentia spiritus* in Rom 8:6.⁴⁰ As for justice, which Bruno characterizes as the virtue by which

³⁵ For David and Salomon, see *ibid.* 2.9, PL 165:932B–C.

³⁶ Grégoire, *Bruno de Segni*, 156.

³⁷ For Bruno's animosity against philosophers, see *ibid.*, 147–49, 220, 245.

³⁸ See Mähl, *Quadriga virtutum*, 104–5.

³⁹ *Sententiae* 2.4, PL 165:911C (alluding to 1 Cor 3:19). See also *Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:307A: "Hyacinthus . . . prudentiam significat, quae de coelestibus a Deo descendit, secundum illud: 'Omnis sapientia a Deo est' [Eccli 1:1]"; *Sententiae* 6.2, De confessoribus sermo 7, 1066B–C: "hyacinthus . . . ad sapientiam te provocat, quae de sursum est; quia 'omnis sapientia a Domino Deo est' [Eccli 1:1]."

⁴⁰ Cf., e.g., Peter Damian, Ep. 23, ed. Riedel 1:219; Otloh of Sankt Emmeram, *De cursu*

rulers can obtain beatitude, its value is apparent from secular and ecclesiastical law. But in order to recommend justice, Bruno only brings forward quotations from Augustine and the Bible.⁴¹ Next, Bruno defines *fortitudo* as the capacity to overcome injustice, to bear adversity and to scorn prosperity, echoing ancient but also patristic sources;⁴² the saints and martyrs in particular displayed this virtue, as neither temptations nor torment could bring them down.⁴³ Finally, Bruno interprets temperance as moderation notably in exercising the other three virtues, advancing Paul and Benedict as his authorities.⁴⁴ Secular values are clearly absent from Bruno's mind. In fact, he expressly considers faith the foundation of all morality.⁴⁵ This idea goes back to Ambrose and was often repeated in the eleventh century,⁴⁶ but Bruno seems

spirituali 19, PL 146:208B (=*De admonitione clericorum et laicorum* 4, PL 146:253C). For an elaborated Christian conception of *prudentia* in the Benedictine tradition, see István Bejczy, "Prudence chrétienne: Odon de Tournai et la parabole de l'intendant infidèle," *Revue bénédictine* 110 (2000): 284–300.

⁴¹ *Sententiae* 2.4, PL 165:912A–C.

⁴² Macrobius, *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* 1.8.7, ed. Jacobus Willis (Leipzig, 1963), already connected *fortitudo* with "tolerare fortiter vel adversa vel prospera." Cf. also, e.g., Jerome, *Commentaria in Ecclesiasten* 7:19, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 72 (Turnhout, 1959), 309 ("Qui enim timet deum, nec prosperis eleuatur, nec opprimitur aduersis"); Augustine, Ep. 244, ed. A. Goldbacher, CSEL 57 (Vienna, 1911), 581 ("nos temperanter prospera saeculi huius contemnere et fortiter aduersa tolerare"); and Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob* 31.28.55, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 143B (Turnhout, 1985), 1590 ("Ne ergo prematur aduersis, habet uim fortitudinis; ne eleuetur prosperis, habet pondus desuper incidentis").

⁴³ *Sententiae* 2.4, PL 165:912C–913A. Cf. *Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:307A: "fortitudo . . . qua SS. martyres . . . in Christi fide fortissimi exstiterunt", likewise *Sententiae* 6.2, *De confessorum sermo* 7, PL 165:1066C.

⁴⁴ *Sententiae* 2.4, PL 165:913A–C. Cf. *Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:307B: "temperantia inter omnes virtutes media discurrit, omnesque conciliat, atque conjungit."

⁴⁵ See *Sententiae* 2.1, PL 165:901B: "fides . . . in toto virtutum exercitu prima est. Omnes aliae virtutes eam sequuntur"; cf. *Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:353A: *fides* is "omnium virtutum prima et maxima"; see also next note. Even charity, which Paul declares the greatest of the theological virtues (1 Cor 13:13), is without value "nisi fides adsit" (*Sententiae* 2.1, PL 165:901B); at 3.3 (910B–C) Bruno explains that charity is greatest in the sense that it is the only virtue which remains in the afterlife (cf. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 1.38.42–39.43). But see Bruno of Segni's prosimetrum 6.3 on the Canticle, ed. Peter Stolz, "Die Gedichte des Hoheliedkommentars und der 'Expositio de muliere forte' Brunos von Segni," *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* 72 (1978): 1–46, esp. 24: "Dedit michi caritatem / virtutum omnium matrem."

⁴⁶ See Ambrose, *Explanatio psalmi XL* 4, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 64 (Vienna, 1919), 231: "fides enim uirtutum omnium stabile fundamentum est." For eleventh-century echoes, see, e.g., Peter Damian, Ep. 1, ed. Reindel, 1:66 ("fides autem omnium virtutum sit proculdubio fundamentum"), Ep. 17, ed. Reindel, 1:159 ("fides fundamentum est et origo virtutum"), Ep. 81, ed. Reindel, 2:418 ("Fides est origo virtutum, fides bonorum operum fundamentum"); and Otloh of Sankt Emmeram, *De admonitione clericorum et laicorum* 6, PL 146:255D ("fidem,

to have taken it quite literally. Although he puts the cardinal above the remedial virtues, as we have seen above, the theological virtues not only come first for him⁴⁷ but even determine the nature of all other virtues. Taking the dictum *impossibile est sine fide placere Deo* (Hebr 11:6) to the letter, Bruno condemns any virtue which does not spring from faith as false and perfidious:

It might seem that heretics, pagans, philosophers and Jews possess the same adornments that are used by the spouse of Christ. But these adornments are different in the sense that they are not of gold, although they seem to be made of it. For the only golden wisdom is the one confirmed by evangelical and apostolic doctrine. Any faith, any charity, any humility, mercy, peace, patience, justice or obedience which does not shine with the gold of apostolic doctrine, is false, corrupt, impure and must be shunned like death or poison.⁴⁸

This bold passage sufficiently explains why Bruno did not enter into discussion with classical authors on the subject of the cardinal virtues: in his eyes, non-Christian views were only worthy of contempt. Christendom borrowed the names of the virtues from pagan sources, but not their contents – exactly as Rupert of Deutz argued as well. It is only in the Church that the virtues exist, states Bruno in the final paragraphs of “*De ornamentis Ecclesiae*,” although not always in a visible form. Different virtues become manifest in different times. As for the cardinal virtues, Bruno points to certain particular occasions: they notably reveal themselves during Lent, ecclesiastical celebrations and Church councils.⁴⁹ This latter view seems rather curious; connecting

quae fundamentum est virtutum omnium, primo colligere et ponere debetis”). Peter Lombard incorporated a similar formula in *III Sent.* 23.9.

⁴⁷ Whenever Bruno enumerates the theological and the cardinal virtues in one breath, the theological virtues come first. Apart from the order of the chapters in book 2 of the *Sententiae*, see *Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:319B–C (with *fides* as the highest virtue of all), 340C (cf. 347C); and *Sententiae* 4.8, *Sermo 2 de ramis palmarum*, PL 165:999C–D.

⁴⁸ *Sententiae* 2.12, PL 165:940C–D: “Videntur enim haeretici, pagani, philosophi, et Judaei eadem ipsa ornamenta habere, quibus sponsa Christi uititur, sed in hoc differunt, quod aurea non sunt, quamvis aurea esse videantur. Nulla enim sapientia aurea est, nisi ea quae evangelica et apostolica doctrina confirmatur. Quaecunque igitur fides, quaecunque charitas, quaecunque humilitas, misericordia, pax, patientia, justitia, vel obedientia fuerit, si apostolica doctrina auro non splenderit, falsa est, corrupta est, immunda est, et tanquam mors, et venenum fugienda est.” Cf. also *Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:319A: “virtutes . . . non terrenam, sed coelestem habent originem; nullam enim virtutem, nisi inde venientem habemus.” Bruno often associated wisdom and prudence with gold, perhaps under the influence of Prov 16:16 (“Posside sapientiam, quia auro melior est, et acquire prudentiam, quia pretiosior est argento”).

⁴⁹ *Sententiae* 2.12, PL 165:942A–B. Cf. *ibid.* 4.8, *Sermo 2 de ramis palmarum*, where Bruno interprets the Holy Week as an approach to religion and virtue (998B), adding, however, that the Holy Week stands for all time available to human beings, who should therefore always observe all virtues (998C–D, 999C–D).

the cardinal virtues to the ruling classes or to public responsibilities would have been more in line with Bruno's preceding chapters.

Thus Bruno's *Sententiae* present the cardinal virtues as the basic principles of Christian politics. The bishop of Segni addresses himself to secular rulers in particular, but the virtues apply with equal force to ecclesiastical authorities, quite in accordance with the Gelasian ring of his words. The apostles and saints perfectly incorporate the virtues, as Bruno emphasizes, and princes as well as bishops and priests must model themselves on their example. What secular rulers and the clergy share is governmental duty, to which Bruno consistently refers with the verb *regerere*. The cardinal virtues, which govern the world (*quibus totus regitur mundus*), apply in particular to those in charge of government (*quibus mundi regimina credita sunt*); likewise, it is in accordance with the virtues embodied by the saints that the Church is governed (*Ecclesia . . . regi potest, Ecclesia regitur*) and that any individual who takes up governmental duties in the Church (*Ecclesiam Dei regendam suscipiat*) must guide himself.⁵⁰ In his commentary on Exodus, Bruno even relates the cardinal virtues first of all to ecclesiastical authorities, notably to bishops. True enough, he connects justice with *regia potestas* and hence considers it a virtue of kings, emphasizing, however, that justice is also a virtue of popes and of bishops.⁵¹ In fact, Bruno attributes all four virtues only to spiritual leaders and not to secular rulers in this work. Taking the Ark of the Covenant as a figure of the Church, Bruno interprets its four rings (Ex 25:12) as the cardinal virtues *sine quibus haec arca nec moveri, nec portari potest*; the two carrying-poles which must be put into the rings (Ex 25:13) stand for the doctors of the Church and the bishops on whose authority, preaching and instruction the Church rests, and who should therefore never detach themselves from the virtues.⁵² The sacerdotal vestments of Aaron are composed of four textiles (Ex 28) which likewise stand for the cardinal virtues and make up together the

⁵⁰ Ibid. 2.4, PL 165:914D–915A. Cf. *ibid.* 2.11, 939B (the kings mentioned at Prov 31:1 stand for “episcopi, et sacerdotes . . . alios regentes et corrigentes.”)

⁵¹ Popes: *Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:326A (“purpura enim justitiam designat, quam solis regibus induere licebat . . . et Romani pontifices ea utuntur”); bishops: *ibid.* 336C–D, 337A. See also the next note.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 309C–310A, mentioning only the doctors. But at 313C–D, commenting on the table of the shewbreads (Ex 25:23–30) whose rings likewise stand for the cardinal virtues, Bruno relates the carrying-poles to the doctors and the bishops and even calls them worthy of being crowned: “omnes quicumque circulis adhaerent, digni sunt, qui coronari debeant.” Bruno gives a similar interpretation of the incense altar (Ex 30:4) at 359C–D. In Bruno's writings, “doctors and bishops” are one category, opposed as champions of orthodoxy to “philosophers, heretics and Jews” who undermine the faith.

qualities required of bishops and priests, as Bruno demonstrates at length.⁵³ In a similar vein, Bruno connects the four spices mentioned at Ex 30:22–24 to the virtues; mixed with olive oil (the Holy Ghost), they produce a chrism which gave its name to Christ and is used to anoint the clergy—but not to anoint kings: in contrast to some other exegetes, Bruno expressly reserves the chrism for spiritual ends.⁵⁴ Bruno's commentary on Exodus seems thus to suggest that secular authorities only dispose of justice (which explains why the interrelation of the virtues receives less emphasis here than in the *Sententiae*), whereas spiritual leaders lay claim to all four virtues—including justice, as episcopal rule in particular comprises royal power. Accordingly, Bruno mentions the apostles, who in his view were also kings and judges of humankind, as the prime examples of those who disposed of all four virtues (perhaps after Christ's example, as one might infer from Bruno's observation on the chrism).⁵⁵

The emphasis in the commentary on Exodus, then, is different from the *Sententiae*, where Bruno connects the cardinal virtues to secular and spiritual leaders alike, addressing himself to the first category in particular. Yet it seems highly significant that in both works Bruno's negative examples all centre around kings (Salomon, Ozias, David) and one judge (Samson), whereas his positive examples are connected with spiritual leaders (in the Old Testament: Abraham, the three young men, Joseph, Daniel, Aaron; in the Church: the apostles, the saints, the martyrs, the confessors, the doctors of the Church, Benedict, perhaps Christ himself). In spite of the intended princely

⁵³ Ibid., 336A–337A (main vestment and humeral veil), 337C (belt), 338D (breast bag); see also 355A: “Vos enim, episcopi et sacerdotes, filii estis Aaron. . . . Vos ergo habetis vestem Aaron, vos gloria et decore, omniumque virtutum ornamento induiti estis.”

⁵⁴ Ibid., 362B–363B, esp. 363A: “hoc solis sacerdotibus, solis sanctis et spiritualibus viris attribuitur.” Rupert of Deutz, *De Sancta Trinitate* 15 (in *Leviticum* 2.2), ed. Haacke, 856, likewise interpreted the spices as the four virtues but mentioned the use of the chrism for priests as well as kings: “regale et sacerdotale pretiosissimum conficitur unguentum”; cf. Isidore of Sevilla, *Etymologiae* 6.19.51, ed. Lindsay: “per unctionem sanctificatio spiritus adhibetur; et hoc de pristina disciplina, qua unguis *in sacerdotium et in regnum* solebant, ex quo et Aaron a Moyse unctus est” (my italics).

⁵⁵ Apostles: *Expositio in Exodum*, PL 164:327B–D, 330B; cf. *Sententiae* 2.8, PL 165:926C–927A: the apostles, martyrs, confessors, and virgins suffered on behalf of justice only. As for Christ, cf. *Expositio in psalmos*, PL 164:1225C–D (on Ps 150:2, “Laudate eum in virtutibus eius” = *Sententiae* 6.1, Sermo 5 de martyribus, PL 165:1043C–D): “Non tua vir virtus, qua pugnas, sed tibi Christus in cruce donavit, quando moriens superavit. Sis igitur certus, quia pugnas virtutibus ejus. Sive virtutes coelorum intelligamus, sive virtutes miraculorum, quae per sanctos suos operatus est Dominus, sive etiam sapientiam, justitiam, fortitudinem, temperantiam, caeterasque virtutes, quibus sanctos ornatos fuisse, quibus et vitia, et malignos spiritus, omnesque suos adversarios eos superasse legimus, valde quidem conveniens est ut in omnibus his Deus laudetur et glorificetur”; cf. also *Sententiae* 2.11, PL 165:938D.

audience of his *Sententiae*, Bruno invokes their Old Testament predecessors only to demonstrate their moral shortcomings, whereas the predecessors of the clergy always excelled in virtue. Bruno's ethics thus contains an element of humiliation of secular rulers, the more so as in his exegetical works he willingly presented the kings of the Old Testament as secular authorities, playing down their religious significance.⁵⁶ The case of Salomon seems to have singularly preoccupied the bishop of Segni. This king, who in Prov 8:14–16 attributes *prudentia*, *fortitudo*, and *iustitia* to himself, fell far behind Benedict in his observation of the cardinal virtues, as Bruno avers in a later chapter of his *Sententiae*. Commenting on the verse *Ecce plus quam Salomon hic* (Mt 12:42), Bruno explains,

The Lord wanted these words to be understood as applying to himself. But I can say in truth of his servant Saint Benedict, whose feast we celebrate today: “what is here is greater than Salomon.” Perhaps you ask in what respect Benedict is greater? In wisdom, in justice, in courage, in temperance; in all these respects he was richer and mightier than Salomon. I am not referring to the wisdom of this world, which is folly in God’s sight and from which Benedict always kept far away, but to the true wisdom which leads man to the eternal life. . . . I would not dare to call Salomon wise and just, he who abandoned the God of his forebears, the only God who exists, in order to worship and venerate the heathen gods who are mere demons. And who will say that he possessed courage and temperance, whereas he, effeminate through female company and enervated by the enticements of women, was so much vanquished by lust that he built temples for his wives in which they sacrificed to their idols?⁵⁷

If the Queen of Sheba had been able to visit Benedict instead of Salomon, she would have been much more impressed by his virtues, so Bruno concludes his remarks. The cardinal virtues, then, apply to spiritual as well as secular lead-

⁵⁶ See Robinson, “Political Allegory,” esp. 97; the reason was that Bruno was uncomfortable with the Old Testament portraying the priesthood as subordinate to royal power.

⁵⁷ *Sententiae* 6.2, De confessoribus sermo 2, PL 165:1053B–D: “Quod quidem veraciter de se ipso intelligi voluit; attamen ego de servo ejus, cuius hodie festa celebramus, beato Benedicto vere dicere possum: ‘Ecce plus quam Solomon hic.’ Quaeris fortasse in quo major sit? In sapientia, in iustitia, in fortitudine, in temperantia, et super haec omnia ditior illo et potentior illo. Non dico de sapientia hujus mundi, quae stultitia est apud Deum, ad quam iste nunquam accedere voluit; sed de illa sapientia quae vera est, et quae dicit hominem ad vitam aeternam. . . . Ego sapientem et justum illum vocare non audeo, qui relicto Deo patrum suorum, praeter quem alias Deus non est, deos gentium, qui nihil aliud sunt quam daemonia, coluit et adoravit. Quis fortitudinem et temperantiam habuisse dicat, qui inter feminas effeminatus adeo a libido superatus est, et mulierum blanditiis emollitus, ut uxoribus suis tempa construeret, in quibus suis idolis immolarent.”

ers, but since the days of the Old Testament only the first category has the habit of observing them.

There exist some parallels in this respect between Bruno of Segni and contemporary Benedictine authors writing on the cardinal virtues. In his *Moralia in Genesim* (ca. 1113), Guibert of Nogent (1055–1125/26) interpreted the cardinal virtues as spiritual concepts, connecting *fortitudo* with archbishops in particular who bravely lead their flocks and presenting *temperantia* as an arrow directed against the sins of the flesh which abound in princely courts.⁵⁸ Another example is Hugh of Flavigny (1065–1114), who composed his *Chronicon* (finished by 1102) not only as a Benedictine abbot but also, like Bruno, as a headstrong supporter of the Gregorian reform. Hugh had read about the cardinal virtues in works of Seneca, Ambrose and Gregory the Great, as his quotations indicate. In spite of his partly Stoic inspiration, all persons to whom he attributed the four virtues in his chronicle were ecclesiastical authorities with a reputation of sanctity—Bishop Luper of Troyes (†479), Bishop Madalveus of Verdun (†777/81), Bishop Berengarius of Verdun (r. 940–59), Abbot Richard of Saint-Vanne (†1046), and, last but not least, Pope Gregory VII himself⁵⁹—whereas he characterized royal government solely in terms of justice.⁶⁰ Still, the cardinal virtues illustrate the spiritual superiority of the churchmen in question rather than their political capacities in Hugh's chronicle. Conversely, Iotsaldus's treatment of the virtues in his aforementioned *vita* of Odilo clearly smacks of royalty. The abbot of Cluny observed justice by giving everyone his due, argues Iotsaldus, so that men of all ranks loved him. Odilo notably conversed amiably with princes and ecclesiastical authorities, whereas he relieved the poor (by ordering his monks to take care of them), buried the dead left in the streets (again by ordering his monks to do so) and even deigned to personally embrace a cleric suffering from leper. Moreover, he harmoniously governed many different types of monks and joyfully welcomed guests.⁶¹ These are typical in-

⁵⁸ Guibert of Nogent, *Moralia in Genesim* 1, PL 156:33C (“quatuor spiritualibus, principalibusque virtutibus”); *ibid.* 2, 66A–D (*fortitudo, temperantia*).

⁵⁹ Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon* 1, MGH SS 8:310–11 (Luper), 341 and 347 (Madalveus), 360 (Berengarius); 2, 380 (Richard), 424 (Gregory). Gregory VII is praised for his observance of the cardinal and other virtues in the document announcing his election which was inserted in *Gregorii VII registrum* 1.1*, ed. Erich Caspar, MGH Ep. sel. 2 (Berlin, 1920), 2, and which was repeated by his hagiographers, starting with Paul of Bernried, *Vita Gregorii VII* 3.21, PL 148:49B–C (early twelfth century).

⁶⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon* 2, MGH SS 8:436: “Regale ergo est ministerium Dei populum gubernare et in iustitia et equitate regere. . . .” Significantly, the passage was copied by Hugh of Fleury, *Tractatus de regia potestate* 1.6, ed. Sackur, 473, who subsequently recommended the remaining three cardinal virtues to the king (see p. 275 above).

⁶¹ *Vita Odilonis* 1.6–10, ed. Staub, 155–67.

gredients of princely behaviour and one might well argue that Iotsaldus presented his late abbot as a monastic king, acclaiming his goodness by means of the virtues. Iotsaldus's accounts of Odilo's *prudentia* (as thirst of biblical knowledge) and *fortitudo* (as heroic asceticism) are compatible with Bruno's views; Odilo's *temperantia*, described by Iotsaldus as moderation in exercising other virtues, is almost identical with Bruno's notion of temperance.⁶² Thus, to a certain extent, Bruno could draw on tradition when presenting the cardinal virtues as politically relevant concepts embodied by spiritual leaders. Bruno's views, however, are not only more much more elaborated intellectually as well as didactically, but can be related to specific political concerns to which we must turn now.

III

Thus far our exposition has demonstrated that with Bruno of Segni the cardinal virtues constitute important moral directives of public responsibilities in the Christian commonwealth. According to the *Sententiae* and the *Expositio in Exodum*, the Christian character of any *regimen*, whether secular or ecclesiastical, depends on the observation of the four virtues. Bruno's treatment of the virtues as necessarily interrelated and all-comprising political concepts, unparalleled in the moral writings of his age, recalls Carolingian and Stoic antecedents and seems to anticipate the ethical thought of the scholastics. But in contrast to Stoic and scholastic authors, Bruno interpreted the virtues in a purely Christian manner, as was usual in the Benedictine tradition. In his two writings analysed here, the cardinal virtues have become the principal guidelines of spiritual government—for in Bruno's view, all good government was spiritual.

Bruno's applying the same moral categories to secular and ecclesiastical government is in fact quite remarkable in view of his relentless insistence on a separation of Church and state powers. His political writings centre around the idea that the Church has its own leaders, the bishops, who must govern without any interference from secular rulers. With Bruno, the Investiture Contest is first of all a struggle for power, for the *regimen* of the Church. The secular authorities should entirely leave this *regimen* to the bishops and mind their own business—this is essentially what Bruno thought and defended in the name of orthodoxy.⁶³ In Bruno's conception, ecclesiastical and secular

⁶² Ibid. 1.5 (*prudentia*), 11–12 (*fortitudo*), 13 (*temperantia*), ed. Staub, 154–55, 167–71; for Bruno's notion of *temperantia*, see p. 278 above.

⁶³ See, e.g., Bruno's letter against lay investiture edited by Gérard Fransen, "Réflexions sur l'étude des collections canoniques à l'occasion de l'édition d'une lettre de Bruno de Segni,"

government apparently emanate from identical moral principles but not from identical persons. Yet his reflections on the cardinal virtues suggest that ecclesiastical and secular government at least partially overlap, not only from a moral point of view but also in practice. Governmental activity in Church and state is, if not entirely similar, comparable to a high degree. In both atmospheres Christian authorities wield power over Christian subjects and must do so in accordance with the cardinal virtues in order to make themselves acceptable as Christian rulers. The business of politics is essentially the same for princes and bishops, and even the bodies which they govern are hardly distinguishable: both carry their public duties within the bonds of Christian society. Bruno's separation of Church and state powers would have been much more strict and practically applicable if he had assigned particular tasks to secular rulers (keeping order, maintaining prosperity and the like) accompanied by particular virtues—as Augustine had done before Bruno in *De civitate Dei* and as the scholastics would do later in their political philosophy inspired on Aristotle. It is quite conceivable, however, that Bruno consciously avoided such a strict separation of powers in his political ethic. In his case, the overlap of secular and ecclesiastical government seems profitable to the latter. The suggestion arising from his writings is not so much that secular rulers may just as well govern the Church, but rather that ecclesiastical authorities may just as well govern the state; in fact, they already do so, for popes and bishops wield a *regia potestas* over their flocks. The apostles and the saints perfectly represented the four political virtues, and the clergy, the bishops in particular, are their principal successors. They are morally entitled to government over Christian society, in contrast to the secular rulers who have since long the habit of neglecting the virtues and whose existence seems to be rather superfluous in any case, as they are neither the sole nor the most important representatives of justice.

Thus Bruno of Segni not merely revived Carolingian tradition by conceiving of the cardinal virtues as *Herrschertugenden* and presenting them in a coherent, spiritualized picture. The context of the Investiture Contest gives his statements a political significance specific to his times. Bruno's political writings advocate the separation of secular and spiritual government, with the main intention of dispelling secular rulers from the Church; his political ethic,

Studi Gregoriani 9 (1972): 515–33, esp. 529–30, lines 42–44: “nisi ut nos intelligamus quia sancta ecclesia non a secularibus potestatibus neque a laicis hominibus, sed a solo Deo et unicariis eius ordinanda, disponenda et *regenda* sit”; 531, lines 81–87: “Et hec quidem est doctrina catholica ecclesie ut per seculares potestates episcopi non fiant, ut et ecclesie a laicis non ordinentur, non *regantur* neque disponantur . . . contra hanc [doctrinam] pugnare, heresis est”; and lines 102–4: “ut habeat [episcopus] ius et potestatem secundum Deum ordinare, *regere* et disponere omnia sine alicuius hominis contradictione” (my italics).

however, opens the door to a mixture of secular and spiritual rule which enables popes and bishops to take control over the state. The ambivalence in Bruno's thought closely parallels the double agenda of papal policy since the Gregorian reform, which likewise moved between driving state authorities out of the Church and admitting Church authorities in state affairs. Bruno may not have been the author of papal politics, but he certainly contributed to a moral climate in which the late medieval pretensions of papal authority took shape.

Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen.

BENVENUTO DA IMOLA'S LITERARY APPROACH TO VIRGIL'S ECLOGUES

Mary Louise Lord

THE life and writings of the scholar Benvenuto da Imola (Benvenutus or Benevenutus de Imola) help provide welcome insight into the academic world of fourteenth-century Italy and the state of literary studies at that time. His activities are of particular interest for readers who wish to know what such a scholar can teach us about how Virgil, Rome's outstanding poet, was interpreted during this period of the Middle Ages. A close examination of Benvenuto's commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues* will reveal how fourteenth-century commentators on Virgil reacted to earlier scholastic commentators and to what extent they helped promote humanist ideas.

Benvenuto was born during the third decade of the fourteenth century.¹ He and his descendants were known by the cognomen Rambaldi or de Rambaldis only after his death.² During his youth in Imola he studied under his father, who was a notary and who kept a private school of law.³ It is believed that Benvenuto's main education was at Bologna.

In 1365 Benvenuto was included in the group of five orators sent to address Pope Urban V in Avignon. Unfortunately, as a consequence of his speaking against the Alidosi, who became pontifical vicars for Imola, he was obliged to

¹ For the life and works of Benvenuto, see Lao Paoletti, "Benvenuto da Imola," *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 8 (Rome, 1966), 691–94; J. P. Lacaita, *Benevenuti de Rambaldis de Imola Comentum super Dantis Aldigherij Comoediam*, 5 vols. (Florence, 1887), 1:xix–xli; Francesco Novati, "Per la biografia di Benvenuto da Imola," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 14 (1889): 258–68; Luigi Rossi-Case, *Di maestro Benvenuto da Imola commentatore dantesco* (Pergola, 1889), review by Novati, *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 17 (1891): 88–98; Francesco Mazzoni, "Benvenuto da Imola," *Enciclopedia Dantesca* 1 (Rome, 1970), 593–96; Louis M. La Favia, *Benvenuto Rambaldi da Imola: Dantista* (Madrid, 1977), 173–78; Rosetta Marcello Fissi, "Benvenuto Rambaldi da Imola," *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 1 (Rome, 1984), 487–91; Dorothy M. Schullian, "Benvenutus de Imola," in the article on *Valerius Maximus* in *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum, Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries, Annotated Lists and Guides*, vol. 5, ed. F. E. Cranz and P. O. Kristeller (Washington, D.C., 1984), 347–51; and *Benvenuto da Imola, lettore degli antichi e dei moderni, Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Imola, 26 e 27 maggio 1989*, ed. Panaleo Palmieri e Carlo Paolazzi (Ravenna, 1991), with an introduction by Gian Carlo Alessio.

² Paoletti, "Benvenuto da Imola," 691.

³ Fissi, "Benvenuto Rambaldi da Imola," 487.

leave his native city for Bologna, where he taught and soon earned a reputation as an historian and a lecturer on *auctores*.⁴ In addition he was engaged in writing commentaries on Virgil, Valerius Maximus, Lucan, Dante's *Commedia*, Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen*, and possibly on the tragedies of Seneca.⁵ Violetta de Angelis has cited evidence for a commentary by Benvenuto on Statius's *Achilleid* and has located an *accessus* in Genoa, Biblioteca Universitaria E 11.8 (cf. *Comentum Dantis, Purg.* IX.34).⁶ He appears also to have owned a manuscript of Apuleius, now Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 3384, and to have annotated it.⁷

Benvenuto is best known for his lengthy commentary on Dante's *Commedia*, published at Florence by Jacopo P. Lacaia in five volumes in 1887. His historical works include the *Romuleon*, a survey of Roman history from the fall of Troy and the founding of Rome to the emperor Diocletian, and the *Augustalis libellus*, a short history of Roman emperors from Julius Caesar to Wenceslaus, whose reign dates from 1378.

At the end of 1373 or the beginning of 1374 Benvenuto went to Florence to attend Boccaccio's lectures on Dante. Benvenuto was fortunate to count among his friends, besides Boccaccio, such distinguished scholars as Petrarch, Pietro da Moglio, and Coluccio Salutati. In 1375 or 1376 Benvenuto, because of professional rivalries, found it necessary to leave Bologna and to move to Ferrara. Here, under the protection of Niccolò II d'Este, he continued to lecture and to work on his commentaries. He died between 1387 and 13 August 1388, when his heirs are named in a document.⁸

In 1889 Francesco Novati brought Benvenuto's Virgilian commentary to modern scholarly attention.⁹ He gave a brief description of the Cremona

⁴ Paoletti, "Benvenuto da Imola," 692; Lacaia, *Comentum* 1:xxv.

⁵ For a notice of a manuscript, Laur. 37.5, from the Biblioteca di San Marco in Florence containing *Senecae Tragoediae cum adnotationibus*, see Lacaia, *Comentum* 1:xl. Lacaia cites Francesco A. Zaccaria, *Iter litterarium per Italiam ab anno MDCLIII ad annum MDCLVII*, (Venice, 1762), part 1, 67. For Benvenuto's commentaries, see especially the essays in *Benvenuto da Imola, lettore degli antichi e dei moderni*, including the introduction by Gian Carlo Alessio.

⁶ Violetta de Angelis, "Magna questio preposita coram Dante et domino Francisco Petrarca et Virgiliano," *Studi Petrarcheschi*, n.s., 1 (1984): 193–205. See also de Angelis, "Benvenuto e Stazio," in *Benvenuto da Imola, lettore degli antichi e dei moderni*, 139–63.

⁷ See Pierre de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris, 1887), 192; and Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Iter Italicum*, 6 vols. (London and Leiden, 1963–92), 2:319a. See also Paget Toynbee, "Index of Authors Quoted by Benvenuto da Imola in His Commentary on the *Divina Commedia*," in *Eighteenth and Nineteenth Annual Reports of the Dante Society, 1899–1900* (Boston, 1901), 13 n. 1 under Apuleius.

⁸ Schullian, "Benvenutus de Imola," 350.

⁹ Novati, "Per la biografia," 258–68.

manuscript, Biblioteca Governativa (Statale) 109, and pronounced this pessimistic judgment: “Una rapida occhiata, che da tempo ho dato a questi Commenti, mi ha convinto non esservi nulla in essi da spigolare per la storia letteraria” (“A rapid glance, to judge from the time I have given to this commentary, has convinced me that there is nothing in it to be gleaned for the history of literature”).¹⁰ Fausto Ghisalberti in 1930 corrected this opinion in an important monograph.¹¹ In this work Ghisalberti carefully analyzes Benvenuto’s treatment of each *Eclogue* and of each book of the *Georgics* and appends a list of authors cited in the Cremona manuscript. He traces Benvenuto’s frequent rejection and harsh opinion of the glosses of Servius and his tacit reliance on Philargyrius and the Scholia Bernensis. He is especially helpful in relating the Imolese’s allegorical interpretations of the *Eclogues* to the pastoral poetry of fourteenth-century Italy and to the prevalence of allegory in that literature.

Ghisalberti, however, because he knew only two manuscripts, Cremona 109 and Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Ottob. lat. 1262, was somewhat limited in his assessment of the Virgilian commentary. Since he examined the Ottoboni manuscript only casually, he did not realize that in a great many glosses it actually contains a longer and fuller text than the Cremona witness and provides citations of certain authors as well as references to Benvenuto’s Dante commentary, absent from the Cremona text of the *Eclogues*. Ghisalberti misjudged the relationship of the two manuscripts, stating that the Cremona codex presents the more complete and accurate version. It is the Cremona text rather than that of the Ottoboni manuscript that “shows a tendency to abbreviate,” and the texts of the two manuscripts are by no means identical.¹²

The renowned Virgilian scholar, Vladimiro Zabughin, did not have access to a manuscript with the continuous text of Benvenuto’s Virgilian commentary, but he observed that Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 960, written at Pavia in 1393–94 by Astolfinus de Marinibus, contained the works of Virgil with marginal commentary.¹³ Some of these glosses, labeled “B” or “secundum B,”

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 267 n. 1.

¹¹ F. Ghisalberti, *Le Chiose Virgiliane di Benvenuto da Imola*, *Pubblicazioni della Reale Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova*, Serie Miscellanea, vol. 9, *Celebrazioni Bimillenarie* (Mantua, 1930).

¹² See *ibid.*, 5: “Il testo cremonese . . . pare più accurato di quello Ottoboniano che, pur essendo sostanzialmente identico, manifesta la tendenza ad abbreviare.” Cf. Mary Louise Lord, “The Commentary on Virgil’s *Eclogues* by Benvenuto da Imola: A Comparative Study of the *Recollectiones*,” *Euphrosyne: Revista de Filología Clásica*, n.s., 22 (1994): 386; note the evidence for the relationship of the manuscripts presented in the comparative tables, 387–400.

¹³ V. Zabughin, *Vergilio nel Rinascimento Italiano da Dante a Torquato Tasso*, 2 vols.

Zabughin skillfully recognized as belonging to Benvenuto. Casanatense 960 also includes several glosses by Benvenuto that are not labeled. Zabughin was unaware that Benvenuto's notes extend all the way to the last *Eclogue* and are found throughout the commentary on the *Georgics*.¹⁴ Astolfinus's marginalia do not constitute an original commentary, but are a compilation drawn from several sources, including, besides Benvenuto, Servius and several chapter descriptions for the *Aeneid* from Ciones (Zonus) de Magnalis.

Benvenuto's commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics* is extant in the form of *recollectiones* (*recollectae*), which are the result of *reportationes* of his lectures by auditors who put their reports into coherent and continuous form.¹⁵ It is doubtful if Benvenuto himself edited or corrected these accounts. The surviving manuscripts of the continuous text, all from the fifteenth century, can be arranged in three groups of *recollectiones*. One group, for convenience called *Recollectio A*, consists of Cremona 109; London, British Library Add. 10095, for the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*; and for the *Georgics*, Modena, Biblioteca Estense Campori Appendice 263 (gamma H.5.11). There are many glosses by Benvenuto in the fifteenth-century Naples manuscript, Biblioteca Nazionale IV E 9, containing the text of Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. The margins of the Virgilian portions of the manuscript are very tightly crowded with glosses entered mostly in the fifteenth century, including many from Servius and from Benvenuto, both labeled and unlabeled, to judge from an examination of the first four *Eclogues*. The glosses by Benvenuto appear to belong to *Recollectio A*.¹⁶

A second group of manuscripts, to be called *Recollectio B*, is provided by Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Ottob. lat. 1262 and by Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. class. c.9, and for the *Georgics*, Florence, Museo Horne 2924 (D.3.35). A possible third group, *Recollectio C*, largely dependent on *B* but sometimes distinct from *A* and *B*, is constituted by Assisi, Biblioteca e Centro di Documentazione Francescana (Sacro Convento) fondo antico 304

(Bologna, 1921–23; rpt. Trento, 2000), 1:44, 53; see also idem, "L'Umanesimo nella Storia della Scienza, II," *L'Arcadia* 2 (1918): 99–102.

¹⁴ From Remigio Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, vol. 2 (Florence, 1914), 259, we learn that Astolfinus copied his text of Virgil from Petrarch's manuscript, now Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana S.P. 10/27, then in Pavia. An example of marginalia in Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 960 from Petrarch's manuscript are twenty lines of Servius, at the bottom of fol. 55v, taken directly from fol. 53r of the Ambrosianus MS, including a note by Petrus Parentis Florentinus, Petrarch's father. See Mary Louise Lord, "Petrarch and Vergil's First *Eclogue*: The Codex Ambrosianus," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 86 (1982): 255–57, with bibliographical references to R. Sabbadini and G. Billanovich.

¹⁵ For a treatment of *reportatio* and *recollectiones*, see Lord, "Commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*," 381–83.

¹⁶ See Appendix 1 B, no. 3.

and by Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek F V 49.¹⁷ In addition, Casanatense 960, dated 1393–94, the oldest manuscript known to contain Virgilian glosses by Benvenuto, has marginalia belonging to *Recollectio B*; Casanatense 187, dated 1396, has marginal glosses on the *Eclogues* that are an early form of *Recollectio A*; Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana Rossi 228 (36 D 23) contains among other Virgiliana (*divisiones* on the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*) a short commentary on the *Eclogues* beginning with a passage from the opening of Benvenuto's commentary on *Eclogue 1* and showing an occasional phrase similar to his wording; and a book printed at Naples in 1510, the *Aurea expositio Bucolicorum Virgili* by Petrus Vitalis, borrows from several commentators, including extensive passages from Benvenuto, in the form mostly of *Recollectio A*.¹⁸

Comparisons of glosses on the same lemma in all three *recollectae* of the Virgilian commentary reveal many differences, e.g., in length of treatment, authorities cited, and complexity of argument, all of which point to *A* and *B*, and to a much lesser extent *C*, as separate versions of the commentary rather than scribal variations descending from a single archetype. Even though the same lecturer is clearly involved, the differences in versions are often too many to be recorded in an apparatus.¹⁹

There are many signs that these versions stem from the oral delivery of Benvenuto's lectures. In *Recollectio B* one can find references to lecturing in phrases such as “debitis ergo scire quod rex Mynos de quo audistis heri . . .” and “ut dixi in lectione preterita” (*Eclogue 6.74*, Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 34rb). In all three *recollectiones* verbs in the second person abound, signs of the interaction between the lecturer and the live audience. Examples from *Recollectio A* include “bene scitis quod,” “et aduertatis hic quod,” “volo vos attente notare quod” and “vos bene habetis quomodo.” In *Recollectio B* the phrase “nota quod” occurs often as do “aduertatis ne” and “vos scitis quod.” *Recollectio C* has a very great number of phrases in the second person, such as “vos bene scitis quod,” “aduertatis,” “volo vos notare,” “sed potis intelligere

¹⁷ A renewed inquiry to Dr. Martin Steinmann, keeper of manuscripts, the Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität Basel, has happily revealed that he has now located the Basel copy of Benvenuto's Virgilian commentary, which was long misfiled with another manuscript having the same outdated shelfmark. Benvenuto's manuscript has received the new shelfmark F V 49. Dr. Steinmann has very kindly provided me with a microfilm and a description of this manuscript, for which I am most grateful.

¹⁸ For a description of the manuscripts of the *recollectae* of Benvenuto's Virgilian commentary, see Appendix 1 below. See also Lord, “Commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*,” 375–81. I wish to thank Professor Georg Knauer for bringing the *Aurea expositio* to my attention.

¹⁹ In the following discussion the Cremona manuscript will be cited to illustrate *Recollectio A*, the Ottoboni manuscript will be cited for *B*, and the Assisi manuscript for *C*.

aliter," and "alias audiuisti." With especial frequency *C* interjects brief questions into the commentary, another indication of a lecture with a student audience. Examples are "quomodo," "nonne tu habes," "nonne sequimur," and "quare non."

The use of the first-person singular is a sign that the reporter keeps the wording of Benvenuto, the lecturer. At *Eclogue* 4.3 *Recollectio A* reads "Certe ego credo quod . . . attamen ne videar temerarius dico quod . . ." ("Certainly I believe that . . . yet lest I seem rash I say that . . ."; Cremona 109, fol. 15r). *Recollectio B* has similar wording. At *Eclogue* 4.60 the *recollectae* are in general agreement in the phrase "Ista clausula finalis cogit me credere . . ." ("This final clause compels me to believe . . ."). In addition, with verbs of saying and the like, the third person singular regularly refers to Virgil.

Corroboration that the variations among the versions of Benvenuto's Virgilian commentary indicate *reportationes* of lectures delivered by the author can be found in the history of other commentaries by Benvenuto. Two of the three versions of the Dante commentary have come down to us in the form of *recollectiones*. In 1908 Michele Barbi showed that the text long known under the name of Stefano Talice da Ricaldone is actually a set of *recollectiones* taken from lectures delivered by Benvenuto at Bologna in 1375.²⁰ In 1979 Carlo Paolazzi demonstrated that the version of Benvenuto's Dante commentary in Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham 839, is a set of *recollectae* based on a second series of Benvenuto's lectures given at Ferrara during the winter of 1375–76.²¹ Phrases that Paolazzi found in the Ashburnham text such as "in principio huius mee lecture" ("in the beginning of this lecture of mine"), "de isto heri dictum est" ("concerning this matter it was said yesterday"), and "lectura quam nunc do . . . dilucidatur et declaratur cotidie magis" ("in the lecture that I am now giving . . . it is explained and made clearer every day") reveal an origin in daily lectures rather than in a written commentary.²²

In 1902 V. Ussani stated his belief that Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria 653 contains parts of two forms of Benvenuto's commentary on Lucan's *Pharsalia*, one a text of the finished *Expositiones* and the other a portion of the

²⁰ M. Barbi, "Benvenuto da Imola e non Talice da Ricaldone," in *Problemi di critica dantesca*, prima serie (Florence, 1965), 429–53 (= *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, n.s., 15 [1908]: 213–36). Talice's text was published by Vincenzo Promis and Carlo Negroni, *La Commedia di Dante Alighieri col commento inedito di Stefano Talice da Ricaldone*, 3 vols. (Turin, 1886, Milan, 1888).

²¹ Carlo Paolazzi, "Le letture dantesche di Benvenuto da Imola a Bologna e a Ferrara e le redazioni del suo 'Comentum,'" *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 22 (1979): 319–66.

²² Ibid., 335–37. See also Lord, "Commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*," 384.

rougher *Recollectiones*.²³ Luca C. Rossi, however, in a careful study of the manuscripts of the Lucan commentary, has demonstrated that the two versions of the commentary in the Paduan codex diverge in many interpretations and that they are not by the same author. Only the version preserving the *recollectae* is by Benvenuto.²⁴ In 1984 Dorothy Schullian observed that some of the manuscripts of Benvenuto's commentary on Valerius Maximus "preserve students' notes, are entitled *Recollectae*, and transmit a varying text."²⁵

It would be tempting to argue that the Cremona manuscript, since it uses the more formal term *glose* for the commentary on the *Eclogues* (fol. 41v: "Explicunt glose buccolicorum Virgilii per Benevenutum") and since it alone among the manuscripts contains the *accessus* to the commentary, represents the text to be preferred to the manuscripts that are clearly *recollectae*.²⁶ Another manuscript in this same group (*A*), however, London, British Library Add. 10095, uses the term *recollectae* for the commentary (fol. 106ra: "Explicunt feliciter recollecte Buccolicorum et Georgicorum sub Reverendissimo Magistro Benevenuto de Ymola"). Although Add. 10095 is acephalous and omits brief portions of the text, it otherwise agrees closely with the Cremona manuscript and would seem to indicate that the Cremona manuscript also is the result of *reportatio*. On the whole there are fewer signs of confusion and haste in *Recollectio A* than in *B* and especially *C*, but this greater clarity in *A* may be due to the fact that in many places where *B* and *C* are expansive, *A* presents a simpler and more succinct statement. There are some passages where *A* is in need of editing, as, for example, at *Georgics* 2.136, where five *rationes* are listed for the praise of Italy, but soon in the commentary, six categories of praise are expounded.

I shall not undertake to discuss Benvenuto's commentary on each of Virgil's ten *Eclogues* but shall choose certain ones to treat,²⁷ following a brief

²³ V. Ussani, "Di una doppia redazione del Commento di Benvenuto da Imola al poema di Lucano," *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche, e filologiche, serie quinto* 40, fasc. 1-2 (1902): 199-211.

²⁴ See Luca Carlo Rossi, "Benvenuto da Imola lettore di Lucano," in *Benvenuto da Imola, lettore degli antichi e dei moderni*, 168-77. Two additional manuscripts containing *Recollectae* of the Lucan commentary are Ferrara, Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea II 192 and Oxford, Balliol College 144.

²⁵ Schullian, "Benvenutus de Imola," 347-48.

²⁶ See Ghisalberti, *Le Chiose Virgiliane*, 5 (and n. 12 above). Ghisalberti's misunderstanding about the relationship between the Cremona and Ottoboni manuscripts is perpetuated in the otherwise excellent article by Fissi, "Benvenuto Rambaldi da Imola," 488.

²⁷ In passages quoted from Benvenuto's commentary, words or phrases cited from Virgil will be distinguished by small capitals. The manuscript source is identified for each passage cited from Benvenuto's commentary. The listing of the corresponding places in the manuscripts

discussion of the *accessus* at the beginning of the commentary on the *Eclogues* in the Cremona manuscript. The *accessus* starts with a quotation from Macrobius's *Saturnalia*, cited also in Benvenuto's commentary on Dante: "Hec est Maronis gloria ut nullius laudibus crescat nullius vituperationibus minuatur" (*Saturnalia* 1.24.8; Cremona 109, fol. 1r; cf. Lacaita, *Commentum 3:197, Purgatorio 7*).²⁸ Benvenuto proceeds directly to enumerate six topics to be considered: *libri autor, materia, autoris intentio, utilitas, cui parti philosophie supponatur, and libri titulus*. These topics belong to the type of academic prologue to *auctores* identified as "Hunt's type C."²⁹ It can be traced to the six headings enumerated by Boethius in the first version of his commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge*.³⁰ Benvenuto in treating *materia, intentio, and utilitas* refers not only to the *Bucolics* and *Georgics* but also to the *Aeneid*, although the commentary that follows includes only the first two works. No commentary on the *Aeneid* by Benvenuto has survived, although he occasionally refers to that epic in the extant commentaries, especially in the Dante commentary.³¹ When reaching the *libri titulus* the Cremona *accessus* limits the reference to the *Eclogues*. The *accessus* in describing Virgil's twofold intent, private and public, states that his public intent is to describe "the corrupt life of powerful leaders and lords." His private intent is the gaining of Augustus's favor. Throughout the ensuing commentary the linking of Virgil and Augustus plays a prominent part in Benvenuto's exegesis and helps to give unity to the commentary.

of the other *recollectiones* does not imply that the other *recollectiones* employ the same wording or exactly the same treatment as the passage cited.

²⁸ For the *accessus* to the *Eclogues* in Cremona 109, see below, Appendix 2, item 1. Cf. *Saturnalia* 1.24.8, ed. J. Willis (Leipzig, 1963), 129: "haec est . . . Maronis gloria ut nullius laudibus crescat nullius vituperatione minuatur."

²⁹ Richard William Hunt, "The Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century," in *Studia mediaevalia in honorem admodum reverendi patris Raymundi Josephi Martin Ordinis Praedicatorum S. Theologiae Magistri LXXVIII natalem diem agentis* (Bruges, 1948), 85–112, rpt. in R. W. Hunt, *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages. Collected Papers*, ed. G. L. Bursill-Hall (Amsterdam, 1980), no. 4 (117–44). See A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1984), 18–28. Benvenuto's *accessus* to his commentary on Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen* follows the same Type C as the *accessus* to the *Eclogues*. See *Librorum Francisci Petrarche impressorum annotatio* (Venice, 1503). The final entry in this volume contains "Bucolicum Carmen in duodecim eglogas distinctum cum commento Benvenuti Imolensis viri clarissimi." For more about Benvenuto and Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen*, see pp. 336–38 below.

³⁰ Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 18 and n. 64.

³¹ At *Geor.* 4.321 Benvenuto refers to a future discussion of a passage in the *Aeneid*, book 1, but no manuscript evidence has been located for a commentary on the *Aeneid*. See Cremona 109, fol. 109v, and Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 129va.

Eclogue 1.

In the introduction to *Eclogue 1*, which essentially forms the beginning of the commentary, it is not surprising to find a rather close conformity in wording among the manuscripts. Since the incipit is the standard way of identifying the text, there was good reason, both for the master lecturing and for those reporting his lectures, to maintain a verbatim text at this point. Yet as the commentary proceeds, the need for uniformity was less clearly perceived and growing divergences in wording and in comments among the *recollectae* emerge. At set points in the exposition of each *Eclogue*, when there is a change of speaker in the poem, conformity in wording among the versions tends to reappear.

At the outset the manuscripts agree in expounding the text of *Eclogue 1* according to the four senses: *fabularis*, *hystorialis*, *allegoricus*, and *tropologicus* (that is, *moralis*). In general, aside from stating the literal sense (*fabularis*), Benvenuto throughout the commentary stresses the historical and allegorical senses more often than the tropological. His long study of Roman history and of writers with historical concerns such as Valerius Maximus, Lucan, and Suetonius, makes him partial to this dimension of exegesis. A complete reading of the *recollectae*, however, causes one to realize how insistently Benvenuto emphasizes an allegorical interpretation of the *Eclogues*.

The fourfold method ordinarily followed in the Middle Ages consisted of the literal, the allegorical, the moral, and the anagogical (spiritual or mystical) senses.³² Benvenuto omits the anagogical sense and separates the literal into the two categories, *fabularis* and *hystorialis*. This method would seem to be an extension of the threefold type of exposition, historical or literal, allegorical, and moral followed, for example, by St. Gregory the Great in *Moralia in Job*.³³ Beryl Smalley discusses this threefold method in connection with Hugh of St. Victor's *Didascalion de studio legendi*.³⁴ Benvenuto at the beginning of his commentary on *Eclogue 1* illustrates the historical and the allegorical senses in virtually the same way, repeating himself by associating under both

³² See Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 34 and nn. 153–54. According to Minnis the fourfold method was ultimately derived from John Cassian (ca. 360–435). Minnis illustrates the method by citing the interpretation of “Jerusalem” by Guibert of Nogent in the eleventh century in the preface to his commentary on Genesis. See also Harry Caplan, “The Four Senses of Scriptural Interpretation and the Mediaeval Theory of Preaching,” *Speculum* 4 (1929): 282–90.

³³ Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 33–34. Caplan, “Four Senses of Scriptural Interpretation,” 235, traces the triple division of the senses to Origen.

³⁴ Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1952; rpt. Notre Dame, 1978), 86–88.

headings Tityrus with Virgil, Augustus with the shade of a beech tree and Rome, and Meliboeus with other poets from Mantua. According to Benvenuto's tropological interpretation, Tityrus is the *vir solitarius contemplatus*, while Meliboeus is the *vir civilis activus*.

In Benvenuto's commentary on *Eclogue* 1 there are sixteen instances of Virgilian phrases explained *allegorice* and nine each of phrases expounded *ystorice* and *moraliter*. After *Eclogue* 1 Benvenuto continues to set forth allegorical interpretations, many of them prefaced by "hoc significat," "hoc figurat," "hoc notat" or "id est." He also regularly equates the pastoral characters in the poems with Augustan historical personages, thus combining the allegorical and the historical methods of interpretation.³⁵ In discussing *Eclogue* 5, for example, the commentator is especially preoccupied with identifying the death of Daphnis with that of Julius Caesar and in praising Augustus and says very little about Virgil's style of poetry. After the first *Eclogue* the categorization according to the three senses ceases to be an organizing principle for the commentary, which stresses at this point the importance of the emperor in the poet's welfare. The various senses are invoked as they seemed appropriate, with the literal and allegorical senses predominating.³⁶

Benvenuto's eagerness to praise Augustus is readily apparent in his commentary on *Eclogue* 1. As soon as line 1 he comments glowingly on the protection afforded by the emperor, comparing him to a great oak tree that spreads its sheltering branches on all sides.³⁷

The veneration of Augustus continues at *Eclogue* 1.6–7 when Tityrus assures Meliboeus that a god has given him his leisure and that he will always regard his benefactor as a god. Benvenuto intends the reference to point to Augustus, for he cites Suetonius's *Life of the Deified Augustus*, (chaps. 52 and 53), to the effect that the emperor would accept temples in his honor only when they were dedicated jointly in the name of Rome and that he refused to be addressed by the title *dominus*, that is "lord" and "master."

³⁵ Benvenuto in his commentary on the *Eclogues* very frequently refers to Augustus rather than to Octavian, although the emperor had not yet received the title Augustus at the time of the composition of the *Eclogues*. *Recollectio A* mentions Augustus, but is somewhat more likely than the other reports to refer to him as Octavian. Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), 11, says that Augustus in his early years as heir of Caesar never referred to himself as "Octavianus," a name that belongs rather to literary tradition. Even though Syme considers the name "Octavianus" dubious and misleading, he uses it in referring to the historical period before the title "Augustus" was conferred upon the emperor.

³⁶ See the discussion of Benvenuto's methods in Mary Louise Lord, "Virgil's *Eclogues*, Nicholas Trevet, and the Harmony of the Spheres," *Mediaeval Studies* 54 (1992): 255–56.

³⁷ For the Latin text of this passage, see Appendix 2, item 2.

Benvenuto remarks further of Augustus,

Nevertheless divine names were decreed for him, since he was called Augustus, which according to the clear truth means sacred, authentic, venerable, and consecrated.³⁸

As *Eclogue 1* proceeds toward its conclusion, Benvenuto at lines 59–63 reaches a high point in his praise of Augustus. Virgil has named a number of *impossibilia* that are made to redound to his credit:

Ante leues ergo pascentur in aethere cerui
et freta destituent nudos in litore piscis,
ante pererratis amborum finibus exsul
aut Ararim Parthus bibet aut Germania Tigrim,
quam nostro illius labatur pectore vultus.

(Sooner will light-footed stags feed on the air, and the seas leave fish stranded on the shore; sooner each as an exile will wander over the other's borders or the Parthian drink of the Arar or Germany of the Tigris than his countenance will slip from my [Tityrus's] breast.)

Benvenuto at line 63 directs this statement by Tityrus precisely to the glory of Augustus:

SOONER THAN THE COUNTENANCE, that is, the presence, of that very Augustus WILL SLIP FROM OUR BREAST, that is, from our heart, that is, before we consign him to oblivion, as though he should say, "First all impossibilities will happen before I cease from my love of that very Augustus."³⁹

Given Benvenuto's frequent and sometimes extravagant praise of Augustus, it may seem that the commentator loses sight of Virgil and of his poetry, even though Tityrus as Virgil is closely associated with Augustus and there is a bond between the poet and the emperor. Yet Benvenuto does not altogether forget to comment on the poetry. At *Eclogue 1.7–8* his allegory applies to the writing of verse:

But understand this passage allegorically thus: a TENDER LAMB, that is, some rather new verse will be given by me to him for his ALTAR, that is, in his (Augustus's) honor . . . FROM THE SHEEPFOLDS, that is, from the stables, pastorally

³⁸ "Tamen decreta sunt ei nomina divina, quia vocatus est Augustus, quod secundum puram veritatem est dicere sacer, autenticus, venerabilis, consecratus" (Cremona 109, fol. 1v–2r, cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 1va–b; Assisi 304, fol. 84va).

³⁹ "ANTEQUAM VULTUS id est presentia ipsius Augusti LABATUR NOSTRO PECTORE id est corde id est antequam tradamus obliuioni quasi dicat 'primo omnia impossibilia euident quam ego cessem ab amore ipsius Augusti'" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 5vb; Cremona 109, fol. 4v; Assisi 304, fol. 87rb).

speaking. But allegorically, FROM THE SHEEPFOLDS, that is, as a result of my studies there will spring from my breast some modest little verse.⁴⁰

This illustrates Benvenuto's frequent recourse to a *sensus pastoralis* to convey the literal and homely rustic or pastoral sense, to be contrasted with the more imaginative and contrived allegorical sense.

Benvenuto's comments referring to Tityrus and Meliboeus in *Eclogue 1* are indicative of the commentator's sensitivity toward Virgil's poetry and his appreciation of the pathos evoked by the contrasting fortunes of the two herdsmen. Meliboeus, unlike Tityrus, his land confiscated, is forced to leave his home and his native region. At *Eclogue 1.12* Benvenuto has Meliboeus express his misfortune in an accumulation of adjectives, mostly participial:

We have no place of refuge and there is nothing left for us. We cannot rest under even a very small spot of shade as you can, Tityrus, who have clung to your oak, Augustus. . . . I am defenceless, broken, fallen low, and exiled.⁴¹

Tityrus, however, is not without feeling. After Meliboeus's final and despairing speech (1.64–78), Benvenuto supplies the words whereby Tityrus pours out generous offers of comfort, understanding, and hospitality, as expressed in *Recollectio B*:

Now Tityrus, seeing that Meliboeus wished to depart after the laments he had just uttered, and that he was scarcely contented, tries to detain him with coaxing words. He invites him in a friendly way lest he fall upon the noose of despair. He says, "Dear brother, I beg you to stay with me this night." And he describes the food that he can offer him. . . . He says DURING THIS NIGHT. Understand the phrase as follows: "In this time of trouble and storm which is as dark for you as night." And he indicates that he can rest there ON GREEN FOLIAGE, that is, in this fresh green place. . . . And so he says that the ROOF-TOPS, that is, the heights, of the HOUSES AT A DISTANCE, that is, of neighbors with homes far off, are ALREADY SMOKING, that is, are beginning to smoke. This is in the pastoral sense, but in the moral sense, it is as though he should say, "Death approaches and you are old."⁴²

⁴⁰ "Sed allegorice intellige sic: TENER AGNUS id est nouellus aliquis uersiculus dabitur a me sibi in ARAM id est in eius honorem . . . AB OVILIBUS id est a stabulis pastoraliter loquendo. Allegorice uero OVILIBUS id est a studiis nostris emanabit aliquis bonus uersiculus a pectore nostro" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 1vb; Cremona 109, fol. 2r; Assisi 304, fol. 84va).

⁴¹ "Nullum refugium habemus, et nichil nobis remansit. Nec possumus recubare sub minima umbricula sicut tu Tityrus qui adhesisti quercui Augusto. . . . Ego sum debilis, fractus, lapsus, et expulsus" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 2rb; *Recollectiones A* and *C* lack the full list of these adjectives).

⁴² "Modo Tityrus uidens Melibeum uelle recedere post predicta, et male contentum, ideo ipse Tityrus conatur retinere eum blandis uerbis et inuitat eum dulciter ne incidat in laqueum

Thus does Benvenuto's moral sense give emphasis to and enlarge upon the pathos in Virgil's poem, going even beyond the words Virgil allows to Tityrus.

Eclogue 2.

At the beginning of the commentary on the second *Eclogue* Benvenuto makes a strong claim for the continuity of this *Eclogue* and of each of the succeeding *Eclogues* with its preceding *Eclogue*. This is an important principle for him, one to which he calls attention at the start of his commentary on every one of the *Eclogues* that follow, including the final *Eclogue* 10. At the beginning of his remarks on *Eclogue* 3, Benvenuto rehearses the related themes of *Eclogues* 1 and 2. Similarly at the beginning of the commentary on *Eclogue* 4 he states the themes of *Eclogues* 1, 2, and 3. For the remaining *Eclogues* he is content to comment on the theme only of the immediately preceding poem. Benvenuto believes so firmly in the continuity of the *Eclogues* that he apparently invents an opposing statement in Servius with which he can make a point of disagreeing:

FORMOSUM (*Ecl. 2.1*). Servius says here that continuity ought never to be sought in the *Eclogues*, since each *Eclogue* has its own subject matter. And so no order is to be investigated. Nevertheless, I wish you to consider carefully that this *Eclogue* is a continuation, necessarily so, of the first *Eclogue*. The first *Eclogue*, therefore, contains the complaint of Meliboeus along with the congratulation for the restitution of the property of Tityrus. This second *Eclogue* contains the complaint of Tityrus (Virgil) concerning the reluctance of Augustus, who did not speedily admit him to favor and grant the restoration of his property.⁴³

desperationis. Et dicit: 'Care frater, rogo te quod stes hac nocte mecum.' Et describit cibaria que offert sibi posse dare. . . . Et dicit HAC NOCTE. Et intellige 'in ista aduersitate et tempestate que est tibi obscura, ut nox.' Et assignat quod possit ibi requiescere SUPER FRONDE VIRIDI id est in isto loco uiridi. . . . Ideo dicit et CULMINA SUMMA id est alta VILLARUM PROCUL id est a longe existentium IAM FUMANT id est incipiunt fumare. Et hoc pastoraliter, sed moraliter quasi dicat 'Mors appropinquat et tu senex' " (Ottob. lat. 1262, fols. 6vb-7rb; Cremona 109, fol. 5v, is briefer but has some of these sentiments; cf. Assisi 304, fol. 88rb).

⁴³ "FORMOSUM (*Ecl. 2.1*). Dicit Seruius hic quod nunquam debet peti continuatio in Eglogis, quia quelibet Egloga habet materiam per se. Ideo nullus ordo est inuestigandus. Tamen uolo uos perpendere quod ista Egloga continuatur et necessario ad primam. Prima ergo Egloga continet querimoniam Melibei cum gratulatione restitutionis bonorum Tityri. Ista secunda Egloga continet querimonium Tityri super duriciem Augusti qui cito non admittebat eum ad gratiam et bonorum restitutionem suorum" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 7rb; Cremona 109, fol. 5v, is very similar to but not exactly the same; Assisi 304, fol. 88va, follows the Ottoboni manuscript).

After careful search in Servius, I have failed to find precisely the statement that Benvenuto attributes to him. Perhaps what provoked Benvenuto's remark complaining that Servius said that there was no continuity between *Eclogues* was Servius's comment on *Eclogue* 9.1:

and this *Eclogue* does not have a continuous song, but Virgil brought together to it some bits from different places in Theocritus.⁴⁴

What Servius is saying here, however, does not pertain to continuity between *Eclogues* but rather to continuity within *Eclogue* 9.

Because Ghisalberti has observed that in Italian manuscripts the scholia of Philargyrius were ordinarily confused with those of Servius,⁴⁵ I have also searched, in vain, in Philargyrius for the statement about continuity alleged by Benvenuto to have been written by Servius.⁴⁶ Likewise a survey of the *Scholia Bernensis* has failed to locate this statement.⁴⁷ In fact, Servius says something rather different about the order and relationship of the *Eclogues* from what Benvenuto reports. In the introduction to the commentary on the *Eclogues* Servius says,

Neither the number here is in doubt nor the order of the books, certainly since the *Eclogues* form one book: concerning the *Eclogues* many waver in opinion, for even though there are ten, nevertheless it is uncertain in what order they were written. Many believe that two are certain according to the following witness, the last as in the case of (10.1) "extremum hunc" and the first, according to *Georgics* (4.566), "Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi"; others believe the following is first (6.1) "Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu."⁴⁸

Thus, *pace* Benvenuto, Servius states an implicit belief in continuity among the *Eclogues* since though ten in number they together form a single book.

⁴⁴ *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica commentarii*, ed. G. Thilo (Leipzig, 1887; rpt. Hildesheim, 1961), 108: "et haec ecloga continuum non habet carmen, sed de diversis locis Theocriti aliqua ad eam contulit."

⁴⁵ Ghisalberti, *Le Chiose Virgiliane*, 82 (14) n. 2.

⁴⁶ See *Iunii Philargyrii Grammatici Explanatio in Bucolica Vergilii*, ed. H. Hagen in *Appendix Serviana*, vol. 3, fasc. 2 of *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii* (Leipzig, 1902; rpt., Hildesheim, 1961).

⁴⁷ Hermann Hagen, *Scholia Bernensis ad Vergili Bucolica atque Georgica* (Leipzig, 1867; rpt. Hildesheim, 1967).

⁴⁸ "Nec numerus hic dubius est nec ordo librorum, quippe cum unus sit liber: de eclogis multi dubitant, quae licet decem sint, incertum tamen est, quo ordine scriptae sint. Plerique duas certas volunt ipsius testimonio, ultimam, ut (X 1) 'extremum hunc,' (et primam, ut) in Georgicis (IV 566) 'Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi'; alii primam illam volunt (VI 1) 'prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu'" (Servius, *In Verg. Buc. prooem*, ed. Thilo, 3, lines 14-20).

Again, despite Benvenuto's charges, Servius does investigate the order of the poems, giving evidence concerning the last and the first *Eclogues*.⁴⁹ There is further reason for concluding that Benvenuto's claim that Servius did not believe in the continuity of the *Eclogues* is really a fiction devised to emphasize Benvenuto's own opinions. Benvenuto in his commentary on *Eclogue 2*, very soon after chastising Servius, does contrive an imaginary scenario whereby he explains the apparent inconsistency by which Corydon (Virgil) complains of Alexis's (Augustus's) reluctance to restore his property, which Benvenuto has shown in his commentary on *Eclogue 1* was already restored to the poet. In this scene of *Eclogue 1*, when Tityrus generously provides hospitality for the night to the bereft Meliboeus, Tityrus elaborates his troubles suffered before he gained the favor of Augustus and describes his problems before he was accepted into the Emperor's favorable regard, thus opening the way for the alleged explanation of Augustus's reluctance in *Eclogue 2*.⁵⁰

In reality Virgil's second *Eclogue* has nothing to do with Octavian (Augustus). The poem is an account of the unsuccessful passion of a country shepherd for a young citified slave, as Virgil's first two lines suggest:

Formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexim,
delicias domini, nec quid speraret habebat.

(The shepherd Corydon burned with love for the fair Alexis, the favorite of his master, nor did he have anything to hope for.)

Benvenuto partly follows Servius, who among other possibilities equates Corydon with Virgil and Alexis with Caesar.⁵¹ The identity of this Caesar is somewhat ambiguous. After his introduction to *Eclogue 2*, Benvenuto begins his gloss on 2.1 by identifying the characters in the poem. Whereas Servius had equated Alexis with "Caesar," Benvenuto specifies that Alexis is Augustus:

⁴⁹ Modern editors of the *Eclogues* do not necessarily agree with the rather simple criterion by which Servius decides the order in which the *Eclogues* were composed. See, e.g., Wendell Clausen, *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues* (Oxford, 1994), 266, who argues that *Eclogue 9* was written before *Eclogue 1*.

⁵⁰ For Benvenuto's text of this imaginary scenario in *Eclogue 2*, see Ghisalberti, *Le Chiose Virgiliane*, 81 (13), from Cremona 109; for the text from Ottob. lat. 1262, see below, Appendix 2, item 3.

⁵¹ Servius thus begins his commentary on *Eclogue 2.1* (ed. Thilo, 18): "Corydonis in persona Vergilius intellegitur, Caesar Alexis in persona inducitur. ARDEBAT id est inpatienter diligebat et alebat et laudabat. ALEXIM dicunt Alexandrum, qui fuit servus Asinii Pollionis, quem Vergilius, rogatus ad prandium, cum vidisset in ministerio omnium pulcherrimum, dilexit eumque dono accepit. Caesarem quidam acceperunt, formosum in operibus et gloria. Alii puerum Caesaris, quem si laudasset, gratam rem Caesari fecisset. Nam Vergilius dicitur in pueros habuisse amorem: nec enim turpiter eum diligebat. Alii Corydona, Asinii Pollionis puerum, adamatum a Vergilio ferunt, eumque a domino datum."

The SHEPHERD CORYDON, that is, the poet Virgil, sweetly singing, BURNED WITH LOVE FOR . . . FAIR ALEXIS, that is, Augustus. And he says FAIR since Augustus was fair and handsome. Others say FAIR, that is, oft spoken of. But that very Augustus was most handsome as Suetonius writes in *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars* [chap. 79].⁵²

At *Eclogue* 2.2, however, the Caesar who is the *dominus* (“master”) of Alexis, is said by all three of Benvenuto’s *recollectiones* to be Julius Caesar: “DELICIAS DOMINI id est Gaii Iulii Cesaris.” The gloss labeling the “master” of Alexis as Julius Caesar, thereby making Augustus the *puer* or the *deliciae* of Julius Caesar, is suggested by Suetonius in the *Life of the Deified Augustus*, chap. 68.⁵³ Here is an example of the problems arising from the allegorical method as employed by Benvenuto in the attempt to equate characters in the *Eclogues* with actual personages in the Augustan era. Benvenuto’s intent in *Eclogue* 2 is to emphasize Augustus as a hoped-for literary patron of Virgil and to deny the validity of the homoerotic nature of the relation between Corydon and Alexis in Virgil’s poem. Benvenuto vehemently rejects Servius’s statement that Virgil had a love for boys.⁵⁴ He regards this charge as base and shameful and cries out, “Absit ista dementia!” (“Away with this madness!”). He defends *Eclogue* 2 as “utilissima et honestissima” (“most useful and honorable”) and considers that the reason for Servius’s remarks was “fatuitas” (“stupidity”).⁵⁵

If by any chance Virgil truly intended to cast Corydon playfully as a depiction of himself, there are moments of sly humor in the *Eclogue*, as when the poet speaks slightly of Corydon’s literary abilities and mannerisms and his self-despair at *Eclogue* 2.3–7:

Tantum inter densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos
adsidue ueniebat. Ibi haec incondita solus

⁵² “CORYDON PASTOR id est Virgilius poeta dulciter canens ardebat . . . ALEXIM FORMOSUM id est Augustum. Et dicit FORMOSUM, quia Augustus fuit formosus et pulcer. Alii dicunt FORMOSUM id est famosum. Sed ipse Augustus erat pulcerissimus ut scribit Suetonius *De XII Cesaribus* [Vita Divi Augusti 79]” (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 7va–b; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 6r; Assisi 304, fol. 88vb).

⁵³ Suetonius, *Vita Divi Augusti* 68: “Prima iuventa variorum dedecorum infamiam subiit. Sextus Pompeius ut effeminatum insectatus est; M. Antonius adoptionem avunculi stupro meritum.”

⁵⁴ See n. 51 above. Cf. the note on *Alexin* in Clausen, *Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*, 64. Clausen cites Martial, Apuleius, and the *Vita Donati* for notices of Alexis, the slave-boy loved by Virgil.

⁵⁵ ““Quomodo predicasset de se ipso istud vicium pessimum? Sed tu diceres: ‘Quid ergo movit Servium?’ Dico quod fatuitas movit eum” (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 2ra; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 6r; Assisi 304, fol. 88va.)

montibus et siluis studio iactabat inani:
 "O crudelis Alexi, nihil mea carmina curas?
 nil nostri miserere? mori me denique cogis?"

(Regularly he would come only among the thick beeches with their shady peaks. There alone he would hurl these artless words in vain to the mountains and woods: "Oh cruel Alexis, do you care nothing for my poems? Do you have no pity at all for me? At last do you drive me to death?")

In characteristic fashion Benvenuto allegorizes this passage, with reference to Augustan persons and places.⁵⁶

Another source of humor at the expense of Corydon occurs when the shepherd endeavors to convince himself and Alexis of his good looks, at *Eclogue 2.25–27*:

Nec sum adeo informis: nuper me in litore uidi,
 cum placidum uentis staret mare; non ego Daphnus
 iudice te metuam, si numquam fallit imago.

(I am not so ugly: recently I saw myself on the shore when the sea stood calm with the help of the winds; with you as judge I shall not fear Daphnis if the reflection never deceives.)

Thus does Corydon bolster his own self-confidence by a comparison with Daphnis, the ideal shepherd.

Nicholas Trevet, with his technical interests and training, used this passage to comment on the developing science of perspective. Benvenuto here follows Servius, who remarks that "nothing deceives so much as a reflection, for in a mirror everything is shown reversed, and in the water a whole oar is seen as broken."⁵⁷ Benvenuto adds more examples of the distortion of reflected images:

And a mirror deceives, since a concave mirror makes the face full. If the mirror is round, then it makes the face thin and long. If it is flat, it makes the face even (or natural). I say indeed further that it can become a mirror when you will see the feet stand on top and the head below. And so he says, "if the reflection never deceives."⁵⁸

⁵⁶ For the Latin text of Benvenuto's allegorization, see Appendix 2, item 4.

⁵⁷ "SI NUMQUAM FALLAT IMAGO nulla enim res ita decipit, quemadmodum imago: nam et in speculo contraria ostendit universa, et in aqua remum integrum quasi fractum videmus" (Servius, *In Verg. Buc. 2.27*, ed. Thilo, 22).

⁵⁸ "Et (in) speculum fallit, quia concavum speculum reddit faciem amplam. Si sit rotundum tunc reddit faciem subtilem et longam. Si planum, reddit faciem equalem. Imo dico plus quod potest fieri speculum cum tu uidebis stare pedes supra et caput infra. Ideo dicit 'si imago numquam fallit'" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 9va; cf. Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. class. c.9, fol. 17ra).

Benvenuto in his lectures on *Eclogue* 2 seems also, besides Trevet, to have referred to perspective.⁵⁹ *Recollectio C*, for example, says at *Eclogue* 2.27:

Indeed I say further that the image can become a mirror, which reflecting in it will seem to have the feet on top and elevated, and this happens because of the art of perspective.⁶⁰

Benvenuto's method of explaining Virgil's text by figurative means can be illustrated by his comments on *Eclogue* 2.36–37. He says that the musical pipe put together from seven unequal hemlock stalks, a gift from Damoetas, stands for harmony formed from the disproportion of unlike and unequal elements.⁶¹ Trevet and Ciones (Zonus) de Magnalis had earlier more thoroughly developed the idea of the reed pipe with its seven hemlock stalks as representing the harmony of the seven spheres.⁶²

Benvenuto rejects the explanation that the seven stalks of hemlock stand for the first seven *Eclogues*. He prefers to account for the seven unequal reeds by having them represent the seven liberal arts, serving poetry, and unequal because the poet has to know the bounds of each one of the liberal arts.⁶³ Damoetas, from whom he received the poetic art and style, Benvenuto explains is Homer, not as others say, Theocritus. The commentator remarks that “Whatever Theocritus wrote is not worth one verse of Virgil. Homer was the one who cleared away the snow and who prepared the way for Virgil, as Dante says, “Quelli è Omero poeta sovrano” (“That one is Homer, the sovereign poet”).⁶⁴

⁵⁹ Benvenuto thus shared in the interest in optics and perspective evident in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, a period of great progress in these studies. See A. C. Crombie, *Augustine to Galileo. Medieval and Early Modern Science*, 2d rev. ed., vol. 1 (Garden City, N.Y., 1959), 110–25 (chap. 3, section 3, “Meteorology and Optics”).

⁶⁰ “Ymo dico plus quod potest fieri speculum quod respiciens in eo uidebitur sibi quod habeat pedes sursum et eleuatos et hoc per perspectivam artem” (Assisi 304, fol. 90ra; cf. Basel F V 49, fol. 7v).

⁶¹ At *Eclogue* 2.36–37: “Ergo FISTULA COMPACTA id est coniuncta et conflata SEPTEM CICUTIS id est canulis. . . . DISPARIBUS id est inequalibus. Per hoc nota armoniam ex disproportione dissimilium et disparium” (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 10ra; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 7v; Assisi 304, fol. 90va).

⁶² See Lord, “Virgil's *Eclogues*, Nicholas Trevet, and the Harmony of the Spheres,” 206, 216–17, 224–25.

⁶³ At *Eclogue* 2.36: “SEPTEM CICUTIS DISPARIBUS id est septem liberalibus artibus accommodis et subseruentibus ipsi poesie et disparibus ita quod poeta habet noscere terminos uniuscuiusque scientie seu artium liberalium” (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 10rb; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 7v–8r; Assisi 304, fol. 90va).

⁶⁴ “Quicquid scripsit Theocritus non ualeat unum uersum Virgilii per modum loquendi. Sed Dametas est Homerus a quo ipse accepit artem poetamic et stilum. Nonne Virgilius uocatus fuit secundus Homerus? Et qui rupit niuem et fecit uiam Virgilio ut dicit Dantes: “Quelli è Omero

Eclogue 4.

There is no doubt that Benvenuto was a devout Christian and that he was learned in Scripture. He cites specific passages, for example, Matthew 22.2 at *Eclogue* 3.46 (Cremona 109, fol. 11v); Psalm 18.5 at *Eclogue* 4.25 (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 21rb; Assisi 304, fol. 98va; and at *Eclogue* 8.97–99 and *Georgics* 2.139 he refers to the sorceress Phytonissa in the book of 1 *Paralipomenon* 10.13 (see 1 Samuel 28.7) (Cremona 109, fol. 36r; Ottob. lat., fol. 45vb and fol. 80ra; Assisi 304, 117va). At *Eclogue* 6.34 he declares that the Epicurean opinion that the world was formed from atoms is contrary to the Faith and all good philosophy (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 31vb) and at *Eclogue* 6.41 that the belief in the destruction of the world by fire or flood does not coincide with Sacred Scripture.

The best guide to the tension between Benvenuto's religious convictions and his attraction to classical learning is to be gained from his commentary on *Eclogue* 4. One of Benvenuto's most outstanding efforts in his Virgilian commentary was directed toward expounding *Eclogue* 4. This highly individualistic *Eclogue* called forth the Imolese's remarkable ingenuity and variety of argument. His knowledge of Roman history and his skill in Christian apology are in full display.

Essential to Benvenuto's interpretation of *Eclogue* 4 is quite naturally the discussion concerning the identity of the child whose birth is prophesied by Virgil. In the course of his commentary on *Eclogue* 4.3 Benvenuto presents the view that the message of the *Eclogue* could apply either to Augustus or to Christ. The commentator cites Augustine in favor of Christ and Jerome on behalf of Augustus.⁶⁵ At this early point in the *Eclogue* Benvenuto tentatively states his opinion on this question. Here the *recollectiones* do not show complete agreement.⁶⁶ Did Benvenuto change his mind from one lecture session to another in different years or did the *reportatores* have a varying recollection of the master's actual words? To learn Benvenuto's final answer to the question of the identity of the child who will usher in the renewed golden age, one must wait until the end of the commentary on *Eclogue* 4.

Benvenuto proceeds systematically to give alternative reasons for each section of the *Eclogue*, one if the application is to Augustus, another if to Christ.

poeta soprano [sic] *Inferno* 4.88" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 10rb; Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. class. c. 9, fol. 18rb–va). *Recollectiones A* and *C* express a preference for Homer over Theocritus, but they do not have the citation from Dante. Cf. Dante, *Inferno* 4.88, ed. C. H. Grandgent (Boston and New York, 1933): "Quelli è Omero poeta sovrano."

⁶⁵ For relevant passages in Augustine and Jerome, see Appendix 2, item 5.

⁶⁶ See Appendix 2, item 6.

This double system of allegorization lengthens and greatly complicates the commentary, which, above all, in *Recollectio B*, echoed by *Recollectio C*, shows remarkably inventive exegesis. *Recollectio A* is more concise than *B*, but less well organized, sometimes grouping the arguments together rather than presenting them alternatively.

Such is Benvenuto's eloquent use of this double system of interpretation that it is hard for the reader to accept the most reasonable certainty that Virgil himself could have had neither Augustus nor Christ in mind when he wrote the *Eclogue*.⁶⁷

At the time of the consulship of Asinius Pollio, to whom *Eclogue 4* is dedicated, the leading political figure was Mark Antony, of whom Pollio was an adherent. As Clausen remarks, "In the year 40 B.C. Octavian was a sickly if determined and ruthless young man: the future Augustus unimaginable."⁶⁸ As to predicting the birth of Christ, it is possible that Virgil had explored Near Eastern prophecies and speculation concerning the birth of a child who was destined to be a savior of the world, but there is nothing else besides *Eclogue 4* in the poet's writings to suggest that he could have had a foreknowledge of such a distant and particular birth in mind.

Having established how Virgil has thus far in his *Eclogues* sung *pastoraliter* about humble persons, Benvenuto now intends to speak about Christ or about Augustus, each of whom has exceeded the fulfillment of all others whom he has treated.⁶⁹ At *Eclogue 4.6* the commentator poses an alternative basic to the *Eclogue*:

NOW THE VIRGIN RETURNS, that is, Justice, who held sway at the time of Saturn. Thus you learn from Ovid that the Virgin is Justice [*Fasti* 1.249–50]; she now RETURNS. And it is true if one speaks about Augustus, since at that time justice, also peace and liberty held forth. But to speak of Christ, the VIRGIN of course is Mary. The REIGN OF SATURN, which was the best, RETURNS and that peace which was during the time of Saturn will now be in the time of Augustus. And thus you can understand that the matter concerns Christ. You know well that Saturn hates Mars, that is, wars, as if to say all wars will cease. Sat-

⁶⁷ For a modern commentator's suggestion as to the identity of the anticipated child, see Clausen, *Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*, 121–22, who gives reasons for believing that the child would be the offspring of Antony and Octavia, Octavian's sister. This child proved to be a girl.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 125.

⁶⁹ See Cremona 109, fol. 15r: "Aduertatis quod hucusque Virgilius est locutus pastoraliter et de personis infimis semper nec de egregiis nisi incidenter. Sed hic ipse intendit loqui de Christo vel de Augusto quorum uterque excedit formam omnium aliorum de quibus hucusque tractauit."

urn brings about stable works; and so the faith of Christ is stable and firm and shuns battles.⁷⁰

Another alternating statement by Benvenuto about the claims of Augustus and Christ to represent the prophetic figure who will establish the renewed golden age occurs at *Eclogue* 4.15–16:

And behold . . . he WILL SEE HEROES that is great-hearted gods MINGLED WITH DIVINE BEINGS, that is with other godlike men. He calls divine leaders the associates of Augustus himself. As he (Virgil) said above in the first *Eclogue*, “nor could he know elsewhere gods so ready to help” (*Ecl.* 1.41), that is, if Augustus were truly divine and also had divine associates such as Maecenas, Varus, and Pollio. AND HE WILL BE SEEN BY THEM, that is, he will be eminently visible to them. If the application is to Christ, THAT VERY child, Christ, WILL RECEIVE THE LIFE OF THE GODS. And this is true since he led the life of the Father and of the Son. He was a true god. Even though he assumed the form of man, he led a divine life, and he WILL SEE HEROES, that is, his holy men, MINGLED WITH GODS, that is, angels. AND HE WILL BE SEEN BY THEM, that is, because Christ himself will be seen by his holy men and his angels in the glory of his majesty.⁷¹

Notable for its literary and historical allusions is the set of alternatives devised by Benvenuto at *Eclogue* 4.34–36.⁷² He reports that in the renewed golden age, “there will be then a second Tiphys.” He says that the first Tiphys was the helmsman of Jason’s ship and was called the *magister amoris* (“master of love”) by the poets. In attaching this epithet to Tiphys, Benvenuto does not fully understand Ovid, his source for this allusion. In *Ars amatoria* 1.5–8

⁷⁰ “IAM REDIT [sic] VIRGO id est iusticia que regnauit tempore Saturni. Ita habes ab Ouidio quod Virgo est Iusticia, REDIT nunc. Et est uerum loquendo de Augusto, quia tunc fuit iusticia pax et libertas. Sed loquendo de Christo VIRGO scilicet Maria. REGNA SATURNIA que fuerunt optima REDEUNT et illa pax que fuit tempore Saturni erit nunc tempore Augusti. Et sic de Christo potes intelligere. Bene scitis quod Saturnus odit Martem, id est bella, quasi dicat omnia bella cessabunt. Saturnus facit opera stabilia, ita fides Christi est stabilis et firma et fugit prelia” (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 19va–b; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 15v; Assisi 304, fol. 97rb).

⁷¹ “Et ecce . . . ille VIDEBIT HEROAS id est deos magnanimos PERMIXTOS DIVIS id est aliis uiris diuinis. Appellat diuos principes collaterales ipsius Augusti. Ut supra dixit in prima egloga: ‘nec tam presentes alibi cognoscere divos’ quasi dicat si Augustus fuit diuinus et etiam habuit collaterales diuinos ut Mecena(te)m Varum et Pollionem. ET IPSE VIDEBITUR ILLIS id est erit spectabilis illis. Si intelligis de Christo ILLI puer Christus ACCIPIET VITAM DEUM. . . . Et est uerum quia duxit uitam Patris et Filii. Et fuit uerus deus. Licet factus homo duxit uitam diuinam, “que” pro “et” ipse VIDEBIT HEROAS id est sanctos suos PERMIXTOS DIVIS id est angelis. ET IPSE VIDEBITUR ILLIS id est quod ipse Christus uidebitur a sanctis et angelis suis in gloria maiestatis sue” (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 20rb–va; Cremona 109, fol. 16r, Assisi 304, fol. 97vb.)

⁷² For the Latin text of Benvenuto’s extended comment on *Eclogue* 4.34–36, with reference also to 4.31–33, see Appendix 2, item 7.

Ovid says,

Curribus Automedon lentisque erat aptus habenis,
Tiphys in Haemonia puppe magister erat:
Me Venus artificem tenero praefecit Amori;
Tiphys et Automedon dicar Amoris ego.

(Automedon was suited to chariots and to pliant reins, Tiphys was the master of the ship in Haemonia: It is I whom Venus has set over tender love as the master craftsman; I shall be called the Tiphys and Automedon of Love.)

Thus it is Ovid not Tiphys who is the *magister amoris*, even as Automedon was the master driver of chariots and as Tiphys was the master helmsman of Jason's Argo. The pagan source of the phrase is inappropriate when later in his comment on *Eclogue 4.34* Benvenuto applies the phrase *magister amoris* to Christ and develops the application: "And then . . . a second Tiphys, that is, Christ, master of love; aptly master of love, since because of love he earned on the cross the redemption of the human race."

Benvenuto explains that the "second" or "other" Argo refers to the great fleet that Augustus assembled in 31 B.C. by means of which he defeated Mark Antony in the battle of Actium, fought in the gulf near the promontory of Acarnania. The other naval, land and foreign battles according to Benvenuto, will be Augustus's campaigns in Dalmatia, Spain, and Germany, against barbarous peoples, but of fortunate outcome for Augustus. "The great Achilles who will be sent against Troy" is interpreted as the emperor's attempts to preserve the laws of Troy and to subjugate the Greeks. On behalf of Christ, Benvenuto speaks of the "pauca vestigia prisce fraudis" ("the few remnants of former deceit"), a vivid way of expressing the fraud of the "infernal demon" who caused Adam, the first man, to commit sin. There will also arise the dangers of persecutions against the Church. "The vestiges of fraud that bid men to take to the sea in ships signify the need for the Christians and Apostles to roam far and wide in order to spread the Faith throughout the world and to flee from persecution. The injunction "to gird cities with walls" is a reminder of the withdrawal of martyrs into caves as did Silvester when he was persecuted by Constantine before the latter became a Christian. Orders "to implant furrows in the earth" are indicative of the need for Christians to become woodsmen and laborers.

For Christians "another Argo" means the small but mighty ship of Peter which is the conveyor of chosen heroes, that is, the Apostles. "Other wars" for the Christians are not only persecutions but also heresies that attack the Faith. Finally "the great Achilles, who will be sent against Troy" is interpreted as a warning against the destruction of the world on the day of judgment.

At *Eclogue* 4.61, “matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses” (“ten months have brought long weariness to your mother”), Benvenuto finally reaches the conclusion that the *Eclogue* concerns Augustus and not Christ. He bases his decision on a passage in Suetonius’s *Life of Augustus*, chap. 94, according to which Augustus was born in the tenth month: “decimo mense natus est Augustus.” *Recollectio A* is the most forthright in declaring that Virgil’s line could not refer to Christ, who was born after the usual nine months. *Recollectio C*, although with different wording, is in agreement with the sense of *A*. *B* states that Virgil’s line refers to Augustus and not to Christ, but in keeping with this report’s occasional comments of a rather practical nature, remarks that while a mother carries her child for nine months, medical opinion says that it is sometimes more and sometimes less.⁷³ The Imolese master himself, with his large family, was not without experience in these matters.⁷⁴ In his decision Benvenuto did not take into account the Roman practice of counting both extremes in reckoning duration of time, and the fact that in specifying that Augustus was born after ten months Suetonius was following the customary Roman method of counting. In his choice between Augustus and Christ, the commentator’s fondness for historical literature (in this instance, his literal reading of Suetonius) and the importance he attached to Augustan allegory won over piety.

Although Benvenuto’s decision to be guided by Suetonius is noteworthy, perhaps equally remarkable is his rejection of the influential statement by Servius at *Eclogue* 4.1. According to Servius, Asinius Pollio, to whom *Eclogue* 4 is addressed, was consul after the capture of Salona, a city of Dalmatia, and became the father of a son whom he called Saloninus after the name of the captured city. In all its brevity and disdain, Benvenuto’s negative reaction to Servius’s statement is in line with his frequently scornful treatment of the glosses of Servius. His attitude is matched by that of Sir Ronald Syme in the paper, “Pollio, Saloninus and Salona,”⁷⁵ which supplies historical data to indicate that Pollio’s province was Macedonia, not Illyricum (where Salona was located) and that Pollio may never have had a son named Saloninus.

A distinctive passage that occurs in the Assisi manuscript at *Eclogue* 4.4 calls for mention here. In the context of the Cumaeian Sibyl, unexpectedly in

⁷³ See *Recollectio B*, Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 23rb–va; for *Recollectio A*, see Cremona 109, fol. 18v; for *Recollectio C*, cf. Assisi 304, fol. 100ra–b.

⁷⁴ For Benvenuto’s considerable family responsibilities, see F. Novati, *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1891), Ep. 4.17 (6 April 1379) at p. 314.

⁷⁵ See R. Syme, “Pollio, Saloninus and Salona,” *Classical Quarterly* 31 (1937): 39–48. Cf. *idem*, *Roman Revolution*, 218–20.

Recollectio C there is inserted an excerpt from the thirteenth-century *Vaticinium Sibillae Erythreae*, the Prophecy of the Erythraean Sibyl, a work purportedly from the pen of Joachim Calaber, abbot of Fiore. The Prophecy concerns John the Baptist and the birth, life, death, and regeneration of Christ. The Assisi citation from the *Vaticinium* is full of errors and is hastily written.⁷⁶ The same section of the Erythraean prophecy is quoted at somewhat greater length by Petrarch in *De ocio religioso*, which was not, however, the source of Benvenuto or his reporter. Since Petrarch and Boccaccio⁷⁷ were acquainted with the *Vaticinium*, it is possible that Benvenuto himself, and not merely the reporter of *C*, mentioned this prophecy in his lecture on *Eclogue 4*.

Eclogue 5.

Above (p. 296) it has been observed that Benvenuto is principally concerned in his commentary on *Eclogue 5* in identifying the characters in the *Eclogue* with personages in the Augustan era. He is occupied in praising Julius Caesar (the dying and deified Daphnis in the poem, as he believes) and in honoring Augustus. In treating the passage on the death of Daphnis (*Eclogue 5.20–44*), rather than commenting on the aesthetic value of the first four lines,⁷⁸ Benvenuto is satisfied with a prosaic paraphrase of these lines and of the rest of the song of Mopsus. Paraphrase also is Benvenuto's method of setting forth the arresting vocabulary and the bold expression of the beginning verses of *Eclogue 5.56–80*, the deification of Daphnis, which grip the reader's attention and match the structure of the earlier song of Daphnis's death.⁷⁹

Benvenuto's judgment in equating the interlocutors, Mopsus with Virgil and Menalcas with Horace, can be questioned.⁸⁰ At *Eclogue 5.4* Mopsus ad-

⁷⁶ For the Assisi text of the Prophecy, see Lord, "Commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*," 390. For a published text of the complete prophecy, see Oswald Holder-Egger, "Italienische Prophetieen des 13. Jahrhunderts. I," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 15 (1890): 143–78; also *Neues Archiv* 30 (1905): 323–35.

⁷⁷ *Francisci Petrarchae Opera que extant omnia* (Basel, 1554), 343; Giovanni Boccaccio, *De mulieribus claris*, chap. 21, "De Erytrea seu Eriphila sibilla," ed. and trans. Virginia Brown, The I Tatti Renaissance Library 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 2001), 84–87.

⁷⁸ "Extinctum Nymphae crudeli funere Daphnin / flebant (uos coryli testes et flumina Nymphis) / cum complexa sui corpus miserable nati / atque deos atque astra uocat crudelia mater" (*Ecl. 5.20–23*).

⁷⁹ "Candidus insuetum miratur limen Olympi / sub pedibusque uidet nubes et sidera Daphnis. / Ergo alacris siluas et cetera rura uoluptas / Panaque pastoresque tenet Dryadesque puelas" (*Ecl. 5.56–59*).

⁸⁰ See Cremona 109, fol. 19r: "Dico quod hic introducuntur duo pastores qui conferunt adiunicem et post collationem conueniunt inter se de ista deploratione facienda. Et isti pastores sunt Mopsus et Menalcas. Mopsus est Virgilius. Menalcas dicit Servius et alii quod est Augus-

dresses Menalcas as the elder: "Tu maior." Yet if Menalcas is identified with Horace, one can object that Horace, who was born in 65 B.C., was younger than Virgil, born in 70 B.C. Furthermore, at *Eclogue* 5.86–87 Menalcas gives a partial rendering of the first lines of *Eclogues* 2 and 3, which he says he was taught by the fragile reed he is presenting to Mopsus. This is evidence that Menalcas represents the author of these poems, and is therefore to be associated with Virgil himself.

Eclogue 6.

At the beginning of his commentary on *Eclogue* 6, Benvenuto describes the Varus to whom the *Eclogue* is dedicated as the great leader, poet, and friend of Virgil, to whom the poet upon his death left the uncorrected *Aeneid* to be burned.⁸¹ The last part of this description, however, fits not Varus, but Varius Rufus, who with Plotius Tucca prepared the *Aeneid* for publication after Virgil's death. At lines 6–7 Benvenuto ventures a further explanation whereby the Varus of *Eclogue* 6 is Quintilius Varus, who was sent by Augustus into Germany beyond the Rhine and there performed many deeds worthy of praise but was finally conquered and the three legions he had with him were massacred.⁸² Again, however, this P. Quintilius Varus, despite D. Servius 6.6, "qui in Germania cum tribus legionibus interiit," was not the Varus of *Eclogue* 6. He was much more plausibly P. Alfenus Varus, a *novus homo* from Cremona, suffect consul in 39 B.C., a land-commissioner who may have helped Virgil, and an eminent jurist.⁸³

Benvenuto has a description of Virgil's Muse, Thalia (*Eclogue* 6.1–2), that is not found in Servius, Philargyrius, or the Bernese scholia:

tus. Sed certe si bene consideretur ipsi faciunt contradictionem. Sed dico quod iste Menalcas est ille idem qui fuit introductus in tertia egloga, scilicet Oratius." Cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 23vb; Assisi 304, fol. 100va.

⁸¹ Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 29ra: "... ipse Varus magnus fuit princeps apud Augustum et magnus poeta et amicus Virgilii in tantum quod Virgilius in morte sua reliquit librum suum Eneydorum incorrectum comburendum Varo." Cf. Cremona 109, fol. 23v; Assisi 304, fol. 104vb.

⁸² Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 29vb: "ET CONDERE TRISTIA BELLA. . . Iste fuit Quintilius Varus et fuit homo armorum et scientie. Et debetis scire quod dum esset dux belli missus fuit ab Augusto trans Rhenum contra Germanos. Et ibi fecit satis magna pro Augusto . . . tamen in fine ipse Varus infelicissime fuit debellatus in tantum quod tres legiones electe quas habebat secum fuerunt infeliciter trucidate." Cf. Cremona 109, fol. 24r; Assisi 304, fol. 105rb.

⁸³ Syme, *Roman Revolution*, 79 n. 4, 235 and n. 8, 245 n. 4; *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3d ed., ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, p. 63, s.v. Alfenus Varus, Publius. Cf. Servius auctus in *Verg. Buc.* 6.6 (ed. Thilo, 66): "Alfenum Varum . . . qui transpadanae provinciae et agris dividendis praeesset: qui curavit ne ager, qui Vergilio restitutus fuerat, a veteranis auferretur."

Thalia is one of the nine muses. She is interpreted as “capability,” and is “with an ability to understand” or “to learn the matter itself.” *Thalia* in Greek is *capacitas* (“capability”) in Latin. OUR THALIA, that is, “with an ability to understand,” since after possessing capability any one can write.⁸⁴

The likely source of Benvenuto’s definition of Thalia as *capacitas* is the Vatican Mythographer, whose statements on the fourth and fifth Muses help to explain the syntax and contents of Benvenuto’s comment about what comes after Thalia.⁸⁵ By his round-about definition Benvenuto associates Thalia, usually referred to as the Muse of comedy, with the powers of the intellect, that is, the inspiration to write.

In *Eclogue* 6.3–9 Virgil explains why his Muse did not blush to dwell in the woods, that is, to write bucolic poetry, and why he excuses himself for omitting to praise the exploits of Varus.

Cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem
uellit et admonuit: “pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen.”
Nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)
agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam:
non iniussa cano.

(When I would sing of kings and battles, the Cynthian [Apollo] plucked my ear and advised me: “Tityrus, a shepherd should nourish fat sheep, but sing a slender song.” Now I [for there will be more than enough who will wish, O Varus, to sing your praises and to compose the tale of grim wars] shall devote my thoughts to a rustic muse on a fine reed: I do not sing songs unbidden.)

Benvenuto in the introduction to this *Eclogue* has Virgil say that he had been inclined to compose bucolic poetry but that a short while later he had decided to write heroic songs, that is, to write in the tragic style and not any longer in the bucolic manner since he wished to set down the exploits of Varus, a great leader who achieved illustrious deeds. But Augustus anticipating this decision, ordered that he should proceed with bucolic song and for a time give up tragic poetry. Benvenuto advises the reader that just as Virgil had

⁸⁴ “Talya est una ex nouem musis. Interpretatur *capacitas*, et est apprehensiuæ seu ipsum discere, Talya grecæ latine *capacitas*. NOSTRA TALYA id est apprehensiuæ, quia post *capacitatem* potest aliquis scribere” (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 29rb; Cremona 109, fol. 23v; Assisi 304, fol. 104vb).

⁸⁵ *Mythographus Vaticanus* III.8.18, ed. G. H. Bode in *Scriptores rerum mythicarum latini tres Romae nuper reperti*, 2 vols. (Celle, 1834), 1.210: “Quarta Thalia, id est *capacitas* vel *ponens germina*. Quinta Polymnia, id est *multam memoriam faciens*. Post *capacitatem* enim necessaria est *memoria*.”

honored Augustus in the preceding *Eclogue* by praising Julius Caesar, so he now praises Augustus by commanding Varus, his leader.⁸⁶ Yet it is clear that in *Eclogue* 6.3–4 it was Apollo (the Cynthian) who had twitched his ear and had advised him to compose in a slender style. In Benvenuto's customary eagerness to introduce Augustus into his commentary whenever he could, he explains:

Even though I decided to write the deeds of Varus in tragic song, I could not, since the CYNTHIAN, that is, Apollo, named from Mount Cynthus, that is, Augustus, TWITCHED MY EAR.⁸⁷

While on the subject of the *gesta Vari* Benvenuto recalls Horace's lines *in poetria* (that is, the *Ars poetica*), which he cites as follows:

Res geste regumque ducumque (et) tristia bella
quo scribi possent numero, monstravit Homerus.

Horace, *Epistulae* 2.3.73–74

(Homer showed in what measure the deeds of kings and leaders and grim wars could be written.)

Benvenuto indicates his appreciation of Virgil's bucolic style by remarking on the poet's choice of vocabulary in more than one *Eclogue*. He notices that in *Eclogue* 6.1 the infinitive *ludere*, which he defines as "to describe playfully," was used by Virgil also in *Eclogue* 1 in the phrase "ludere qu(a)e vellem" (1.10).⁸⁸ Benvenuto comments also on the word *deductum* in *Eclogue* 6.5 under the lemma "oportet dicere carmen deductum":

Macrobius creates an important discussion concerning this word *deductum*, saying that a fine-spun poem is a thin and subtle poem as far as pertains to style, just as Virgil said in his first *Eclogue* "a slender reed" (*Ecl.* 1.2) as it applies to a "fine-spun poem."⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Cremona 109, fol. 23v: "Et aduertatis quod sicuti fuit adulatus Augusto in egloga precedenti commendando Iulium Cesarem, ita adulatur ipsi Augusto commendando Varum suum principem." Cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 29rb; Assisi 304, fol. 104vb.

⁸⁷ "Dum deliberarem scribere gesta Vari carmine tragico, non potui, quia CYNCTUS id est Apollo a Cincio monte id est Augustus VELLIT AUREM" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 29va; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 23v: "CINTHIUS id est Apollo et per hoc intellige Augustum"; Assisi 304, fol. 105ra).

⁸⁸ Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 29rb: "LUDERE id est ludicre describere. Ita habuisti in prima Egloga scilicet LUDERE QUE (qua MS) VELLEM." Cf. Assisi 304, fol. 104vb. See also Cremona 109, fol. 23v: "LUDERE id est ludicre describere uersu Siracusio ad imitationem Theocriti qui descripserat bucolicam grece."

⁸⁹ "Macrobius facit magnam questionem super isto uocabulo DEDUCTUM dicens quod carmen deductum est carmen tenue et subtile quantum ad stilum sicuti dixit Virgilii in prima Ecloga: 'tenui avena' tantum ualeat quantum carmen deductum" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 29va; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 23v; Assisi 304, fol. 105ra). See Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 6.4.12 (commenting

In spite of Benvenuto's repeated glosses describing the "slender" style of the *Eclogues*, he fails to understand Virgil's antithesis, clearly expressed in *Eclogue 6.4–5*:

. . . pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen.

(Tityrus, a shepherd ought to nourish fat sheep, but sing a slender song.)

Instead, Benvenuto thinks of the sheep as representing bucolic poems. He is disconcerted by his own contrast between the pastoral poems of Theocritus and those of Virgil. He thus says,

O TITYRE, that is Virgil, one ought, that is, it is necessary to FEED FAT SHEEP, that is, to nourish, increase, and foster fat Eclogues. And he rightly says FAT on the subject of the Eclogues of Theocritus, which are lean, since these Eclogues (Virgil's) have a larger and double meaning. Since he had said "fat sheep" he adds praise of the song. ONE OUGHT TO SING A SLENDER POEM that is, one ought to do so in order to bring to perfection these fat Eclogues even though in a lowly style.⁹⁰

After his prohemium to the commentary on *Eclogue 6*, Benvenuto sets out to tell the story, the *fabula*, of the youths Chromis and Mnasyllos and their binding of the sleeping Silenus in order to make him sing. The commentator begins by the phrase "Pergite ire id est incipite ire" ("proceed, that is, begin") often used by Livy, as he says, "Ita dicit Titus Livius."⁹¹

A reading of the glosses on *Eclogue 6.13–15* in both *Recollectiones A* and *B* reveals that these reports are apparently based on different lectures by Benvenuto, for they contain varying details and differ in length and in the pace of the lecture or commentary. *Recollection B* makes a point of stating that it will proceed slowly, *paulatim* ("little by little"). It makes reference, as noted, to Livy, lacking in *A*. *Recollection B* specifies that the phrase "minister Bacc(h)i" ("the attendant of Bacchus") is from Ovid, whereas *A* has the phrase "nutritor

on *Eclogue 6.4–5*): ". . . Pastorem Tityre pingues / pascere oportet oves, deductum dicere carmen. / deductum pro tenui et subtili eleganter positum est" (ed. Willis, 372). For additional examples of Benvenuto's glosses on the slender style of the *Bucolics*, see Appendix 2, item 8.

⁹⁰ "O TITYRE id est Virgili OPORTET id est, est necesse PASCERE OVES PINGUES id est nutrire, augere et souere eglogas pingues. Et bene dicit PINGUES ad respectum Eglogarum Theocriti, que sunt macilente, quia iste Eglogue habent maiores sensum et duplitem. Et quia dixerat oues pingues addit laudes carminis. OPORTET DICERE CARMEN DEDUCTUM id est oportet ut perficias istas eglogas pingues licet sub stilo basso" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 29va; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 23v; Assisi 304, fol. 105ra).

⁹¹ Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 30rb. Cremona 109 lacks the reference to Livy. See Livy, e.g., 9.2.8; 21.30.1; 21.57.9; 22.53.9. Between books 21 and 41 of Livy there are twenty-five examples of *pergo + ire*.

Bachi" ("the nourisher of Bacchus") and does not cite Ovid. Neither phrase appears to represent any actual wording by Ovid, but Silenus, the father of the satyrs, is included in Ovid's accounts of Bacchus's *cohors* or *thiasus*.⁹² In order to facilitate the comparison between the versions in *Recollectiones A* and *B* of *Eclogue* 6.13–15, the text of *A*, as represented by Cremona 109, and of *B*, as in Ottob. lat. 1262, is presented below in Appendix 2, item 9.⁹³ By studying these two texts, one can readily compare how each version deals with such topics as the Epicurean sect and its relation to the Augustan era, the interpretation of the names Chromis and Mnasylos, the citation of authors, illustrative details, and the comparative length and the fullness of development of Virgil's meaning in these lines. The two reports will be seen to agree in some wording and to present distinctive accounts in other respects. As noted above, when the reports arrive at a new section of Virgil's text, e.g., at *Eclogue* 6.13, they tend to agree closely in wording and then diverge.⁹⁴

Silanus's first song in *Eclogue* 6 is a highly poetic account of the creation of the world in Epicurean terms. Benvenuto anticipates this song by telling how the youths Chromis and Mnasylos, that is Varus and Vergilius, came upon the drunken Silenus:

They saw Silenus lying ASLEEP IN A CAVE, that is, in his study, since the Epicureans and their followers were philosophers.⁹⁵

Recollectio A provides a background for understanding the Epicurean sect and its emphasis on pleasures which were, according to Benvenuto, well suited to the Augustan age, a time of good fortune and fertility when men turned to such pleasures.⁹⁶ *Recollectio B* gives the popular, simplistic conception and definition of the Epicurean philosophy, explaining its goal:

Epicurus . . . placed the highest good in the happiness of this world.⁹⁷

⁹² See, e.g., Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 11.89–90; *Fasti* 1.397–99; *Ars Amatoria* 1.543.

⁹³ *Recollectio C* here is the same as *Recollectio B*, in this instance following Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. class. c.9.

⁹⁴ See p. 295 above.

⁹⁵ "Viderunt S(c)ilenum id est dormientem SOMNO IN ANTRO id est in studio suo quia Epicuri et sui sequaces fuerunt philosophi" (Cremona 109, fol. 24v; cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 30rb; Assisi 304, fol. 105vb). The philosophical tone of the setting at *Eclogue* 6.16–17 did not prevent Benvenuto from indulging in humor, for which see Mary Louise Lord, "The Use of Macrobius and Boethius in Some Fourteenth-Century Commentators on Virgil," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 3 (1996): 8.

⁹⁶ Cremona 109, fol. 24r: "Virgilius intendit describere bucolice siue pastoraliter sectam Epicureorum . . . tum quia ad tempus felicitatis et fertilitatis quale erat tempore Augusti solent homines audire talia libenter et conuertere se ad uoluptates" (see Appendix 2, item 9).

⁹⁷ "Epicurus . . . ponebat sumnum bonum in felicitate istius mundi" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 30rb; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 25r; Assisi 304, fol. 106va). Readers of Cicero's *De finibus*

The first of the songs that Silenus promised to sing for Chromis and Mnasylos and the Naiad Aegle tells of the original (*prima*) formation of the world. So that this very important matter might be made clear, Benvenuto gives a brief survey of early Greek philosophers and a somewhat longer discussion of the role of the Epicurean philosophy in expounding the physical properties of the natural world.⁹⁸ The account in *C* is closer to *B* than to *A*, although in certain places *C* gives information omitted in *B* but provided in *A*.

Benvenuto claims that a source for his comments on the creation and nature of the physical world is the first book of Aristotle's *Physics*.⁹⁹ Benvenuto most probably read the *Physics* in the Latin translation known as *Physica, Translatio Vetus*, entitled *Aristotilis De naturali auditu*. The modern editors of this translation maintain that the nucleus or core of the work goes back to the translation of the *Physics* by James of Venice, written about 1140.¹⁰⁰ Indeed the *Physica*, book 1, chap. 2, especially section 184b, does have a bearing on Benvenuto's commentary on Silenus's song concerning the creation of the world. At *Eclogue* 6.31 Benvenuto says,

What, therefore, did Silenus sing? Here he briefly expresses what he sang. And he says that Silenus began to sing about the original (first) establishing of the world. . . . And so that this first part which is sung by Silenus and is very important may be clear, you should note that, as the Philosopher (Aristotle) in book 1 of the *Physics* writes, the ancient philosophers had a great disagreement among themselves concerning the origin of the world. And how is that? Certainly because some said that there is one principle of all things.¹⁰¹

This last statement by Benvenuto concerning one principle is based on Aristotle's *Physics*, section 184b, in the *Translatio Vetus*:

It is necessary, therefore, that there be one principle or more than one, and if there is one, it is either immovable, as Parmenides and Melissus say, or it is

bonorum et malorum will remember that he described a twofold aspect of Epicurean thought, namely, that pleasure was the highest good and pain (*dolor*) the greatest evil. The adherent of Epicurean philosophy will reject some pleasures so that he may achieve other greater pleasures and in enduring some pains will avoid still harsher pains (*De finibus* 1.10.33).

⁹⁸ For Benvenuto's survey of early Greek philosophers and of the atomic theory as related in *Recollectiones A, B, and C*, see Appendix 2, item 10.

⁹⁹ See *Aristoteles Latinus* VII.1.2, *Physica, Translatio Vetus*, ed. Fernand Bossier and Jozef Bräms (Leiden, 1990). For an acquaintance with Aristotle's *Physics*, I am much indebted to the Greek text and translation by Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford, 2 vols., The Loeb Classical Library 228 and 255 (London and New York, 1929–34). The notes by Cornford are especially helpful in understanding Aristotle's treatise.

¹⁰⁰ See the Preface to *Aristoteles Latinus* VII.1.1, *Physica, Translatio Vetus*, by Fernand Bossier and Jozef Bräms (Leiden, 1990), xii, xxi–xxii.

¹⁰¹ For the Latin of this passage, see Appendix 2, item 10, beginning of the middle column, from *Recollectio B*, Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 31rb.

movable, according to those physicists who say that the first principle is air or others who say it is water; or if there are more than one, they must be either limited or unlimited, and if they are limited but more than one, they are either two or three or four, or some other definite number, and if they are unlimited, they are either as Democritus said, of one kind but different in shape or form, or also contrasting in nature.¹⁰²

Concerning the link of Benvenuto's comments with this section of Aristotle's *Physics*, it is notable that the crucial phrase, found in *Recollectio B*, "Certe quia aliqui dixerunt unum esse principium omnium rerum" ("Certainly since some have said that there is one principle of all things"), is lacking in *Recollectio A*, fol. 25r in the discussion of the *Physics*, but is mentioned in *Recollectio C*, fol. 106va. None of the reports refers in this connection to the philosophers Parmenides, Melissus or Democritus, named by Aristotle.

Next Benvenuto remarks that some philosophers, such as Heraclitus, had said that this first principle is fire, for he was of the opinion of course that all things are generated from fire.¹⁰³ Benvenuto does not obtain this information from the *Physics*, where Heraclitus is not mentioned at this point. In fact, considerably later, in the *Physics*, book 3, chap. 5, Aristotle associates Heraclitus with the principle of fire but denies that this principle or any one principle could prevail in the universe:

For altogether and apart from whether any one of these (elements) is unlimited, it is quite impossible that everything, even if it is limited, should be or become any one of these (elements), just as Heraclitus said that everything sometimes becomes fire.¹⁰⁴

Besides Aristotle's *Physics* it is necessary to consider Servius's gloss, *In Buc.* 6.31, as a source for Benvenuto's discussion of Greek philosophy. No doubt Benvenuto was influenced by this rather extended Servian gloss, but since Servius says that Anaxagoras was the one who believed that everything was produced from fire, Servius was not Benvenuto's source for this item.

¹⁰² "Necesse igitur unum esse principium aut plura, et si unum, aut inmobile, sicut dicunt Parmenides et Melissus, aut mobile, sicut phisici hi quidem aerem dicentes esse alii vero aquam primum principium; si autem plura, aut finita aut infinita, et si finita plura autem uno, aut duo aut tria aut quatuor sunt aut secundum alium aliquem numerum, et si infinita, aut sic sicut Democritos, genere unum figura aut specie differentia, aut et contraria" (*Aristoteles Latinus VII.1.2, Physica* 184b, p. 8).

¹⁰³ Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 31rb: "Certe quia aliqui dixerunt unum esse principium omnium rerum. Et aliqui dixerant ignem esse sicuti Heraclitus qui fuit istius opinionis scilicet quod omnia generarentur ex igne" (see Appendix 2, item 10).

¹⁰⁴ "Omnino enim et preter id quod infinitum sit aliquod ipsorum, impossibile est omne, et si finitum sit, aut esse aut fieri unum aliquod ipsorum, sicut Heraclitus dicit omnia fieri aliquando ignem" (*Aristoteles Latinus VII.1.2, Physica* 205a 2–5, pp. 118–19).

Servius's statement about Anaxagoras is puzzling, for nowhere in Aristotle's several notices in the *Physics* about Anaxagoras is there any mention of the principle of fire, which is credited rather to Heraclitus, as observed above. Aristotle's *Physics* (187a, book 1.4) says that Anaxagoras assumed an unlimited number of distinguishable substances.

Servius attributes the principle of water (*umor*) to Thales of Miletus, who figures in Benvenuto's account (*aqua*), but not in Aristotle's *Physics*. The Diogenes who said that air (*aer*) was the main principle, listed by Benvenuto but not by Servius nor Aristotle's *Physics*, has been identified as Diogenes of Apollonia, the last of the Presocratic philosophers.¹⁰⁵ Benvenuto agrees with Servius's listing of Empedocles as advocating these four elements. Empedocles plays a prominent role in Aristotle's *Physics*, a work, which, according to *Recollectio B* gives Benvenuto ample ammunition in calling attention also to the important forces of Strife and Love posited by Empedocles: "tamen habebat duo alia scilicet litem et concordiam." The translation of *Aristoteles Latinus* has several combinations of names for these forces: *concordia, discordia* (188b34, 189a24, 198b16, 265b21); *amicitia, discordia* (250b28, 252a8); *amicitia, inamicitia* (252a27); and *amicitia, bellum* (196a18).

Recollectio B next mentions chaos, "Aliquando dicebat fieri chaos," not included in Servius, but occurring once in the *Physics* (208b30–31). With reference to "place" and to the fact that "everything must be somewhere and must have a place,"¹⁰⁶ Aristotle cites Hesiod, *Theogony* 116–17:

And so Hesiod seems to speak correctly when making chaos first. Indeed he therefore says, "first of all chaos was made, but then the broad earth."¹⁰⁷

Listed after chaos in *Recollectio B* is the observation, "aliquando omnia separari et distingui" ("sometimes everything is separated and set apart"). Aristotle's *Physics* often uses the verb $\chi\omega\pi\zeta\omega$ (*separo*). An example of the philosopher's use of this verb, associated, like chaos, with the concept of place, is the following statement which helps to explain Benvenuto's comment:

The same argument, moreover, applies to those thinking that place is something separate or set apart, into which is brought what is brought.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ See the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3d ed., 473; see also Cornford's note in Aristotle's *Physica*, 1:171.

¹⁰⁶ See *Physica*, Wicksteed-Cornford translation, vol. 1, p. 281.

¹⁰⁷ "Videtur autem utique et Ysiodus dicere recte faciens primum chaos. Dicit quidem igitur 'omnium primum chaos factum, sed postea terram latam'" (*Aristoteles Latinus* VII.1.2, *Physica* 208b 30–33, p. 137; cf. Hesiod, *Theogony* 116–17, ed. M. L. West [Oxford, 1966], 116).

Democritus, one of the founders of the atomic theory, who is discussed several times in the *Physics*, is named twice in *Recollectio A* and three times in *Recollectio C*, but not in Servius, although the latter in his gloss on *Eclogue* 6.31 has much to say about the atoms and void. *Recollectio B*, even though it also gives ample attention to the atomic theory and to Epicureanism, seems deliberately to avoid naming Democritus in connection with the atoms. The *reportator* responsible for *Recollectio B* certainly read about Democritus in Aristotle, in section 184b21 of the *Physics*, a section from which he had quoted a few lines earlier than his discussion of the view that “there are many first principles of things, bodies that are tiny and indivisible that we commonly call atoms.”

There is very good reason to believe that Benvenuto was thoroughly steeped in the *Physics*, not only in the beginning of the treatise as in the case of section 184b, but also deeply into the work. When discussing the Epicurean void, *vacuum* or *inane*, Benvenuto in *Recollectiones B* and *C* adds the two words “contra Aristotilem” in the sentence “Et dicebat quod erat dare vacuum contra Aristotilem.” These last two words are missing in *Recollectio A*. Benvenuto had studied the *Physica* as far at least as book 4, chaps. 6–9, which are devoted to the conviction, tightly argued at some length, that there is no void (τὸ κενόν, *vacuum*, *inane*). At section 217b21 Aristotle declared:

From what has been said, therefore, it is obvious that there is no void, neither what is set apart nor connected simply with itself nor in a rarified atmosphere nor even potentially, unless someone intends to call a vacuum the cause of what is moved. In that case the material itself of gravity and of lightness will be a vacuum of this sort. . . . Let it now be concluded of what nature vacuum is and is not.¹⁰⁸

There is a brief observation in *Recollectiones B* and *C* that lends credence to the likelihood that Benvenuto was well acquainted with Servius’s gloss on *Eclogue* 6.31. At the end of this gloss Servius ventures the remark “Dicimus autem ‘haec atomus’ et ‘hae atomi,’ ” thus noting the gender of the noun *atomus*. This observation appears in *Recollectiones B* and *C* (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 31va; Assisi 304, fol. 106vb): “Athomus est feminini generis.”

Benvenuto makes another comment, on *Eclogue* 6.38, that shows he was attentive to Servius’s glosses. Virgil’s line reads “altius atque cadant submotis

¹⁰⁸ “Eadem autem ratio et ad locum esse aliquid opinantes separatum, in quem fertur quod fertur” (*Aristoteles Latinus* VII.1.2, *Physica* 214b 20–21, pp. 158–59).

¹⁰⁹ “Ex dictis igitur manifestum est quod neque discretum vacuum est neque simpliciter neque in raro, neque in potentia est, nisi aliquis velit penitus vocare vacuum causam illius quod fertur. Sic autem gravitatis et levitatis materia huiusmodi erit vacuum. . . . De vacuo autem quomodo est et quomodo non est, determinatum sit hoc modo” (*ibid.* 217b20–217b28, p. 170).

nubibus imbræ" ("And the rains fall from the clouds uplifted higher"). Concerning Servius's gloss Benvenuto remarks,

Here Servius expresses a childish opinion, namely, that when the clouds approach the heat of the sun, they are loosened and then rain follows. This is foolish since no vapor ascends so high as the elemental fire. The sun therefore rising attracted the vapors.¹¹⁰

This criticism of Servius is typical of Benvenuto's scornful attitude. He often consulted the glosses of Servius to his advantage, but did not hesitate to express his frequent disagreement with him in withering fashion.

Besides Aristotle's *Physics*, another classical source to which Benvenuto refers in all three of the *Recollectiones* is Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*. In several of the five books of the *Tusculanae quaestiones*, as Benvenuto names the work, there is opportunity for one of the interlocutors to define the Epicurean concept of the *summum bonum* as pleasure in the sense of the absence of pain. This definition is regularly criticized by Cicero as unworthy to be compared to more elevated goals according to which pain must be willingly endured for some higher moral or civic purpose. *Recollectio B* well illustrates Benvenuto's attitude toward Epicurean belief:

Indeed Sylenus begins with the origin of the world having roots in this very pleasure, since he places the formation of the world according to the opinion of the Epicureans who say that the world is the result of chance; whence notice how they intend to say that it was made by chance and that the soul dies together with the body. And as a consequence this is to invite men to pleasures and to a voluptuous life. This is according to Tullius in the book concerning the *Tusculan Questions*. Epicurus does not dare to deny the existence of the gods; nevertheless he says that they do nothing nor do they take any care (for men).¹¹¹

Thus Benvenuto points to the weakness of some of the most cherished of the Epicurean beliefs. It is difficult to find in the *Tusculan Disputations* a specific statement to which Benvenuto is referring in his phrase "Vnde Tullius in libro de *Tusculanis questionibus*." This phrase, introduced by *unde* is the

¹¹⁰ "Dicit hic Servius unam puerilem opinionem scilicet quod nubes quando appropinquant ad calorem solis resolvuntur, et tunc fit pluvia. Et hoc est fatum quia nullus vapor ascendit tantum ad ignem elementalem. Sol ergo ortus trahebat vapores" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 31vb).

¹¹¹ "Imo Sylenus incipit ab origine mundi radicali ipsius voluptatis, quia ponit constitutionem mundi secundum opinionem Epucororum qui dicunt mundum esse a casu. Unde aduerte uolunt dicere quod est factus a casu et quod anima moriatur simul cum corpore. Et per consequens est inuitare homines ad voluptates et uitam voluptuosam. Unde Tullius in libro de *Tusculanis questionibus*. Non audet Epucurus negare <d>eos; tamen dicit eos nichil agere nichil curare" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 31va).

regular way employed by the fourteenth-century Virgilian commentators to indicate the citation of an authority to which attention is being called. Perhaps Benvenuto is referring to his own statement *et quod anima moriatur simul cum corpore*. “and because the soul dies together with the body.” This pronouncement could be an echo of Cicero’s phrase in *Tusculan Disputations* 1.9.18:

Sunt enim qui discessum animi a corpore putent esse mortem; sunt qui nullum censeant fieri discessum, sed una animum et corpus occidere animumque in corpore extingui. “For there are those who think that death is the separation of the mind from the body: there are some who believe that there is no separation but that mind and body die together and that the mind is extinguished in the body.”

As is usual, however, in the *Tusculans*, this thought gives way to other possibilities and it is agreed that there are many differences of opinion on this matter. A sustained reading of this work reveals very little sympathy on the part of Cicero for Epicurean doctrine.

It is apparent that Benvenuto used several sources in compiling his history of Presocratic philosophy and in his discussion of Epicureanism. He worked carefully, and his account compares well with that of the Virgilian commentators who were his predecessors. Both Nicholas Trevet and Ciones (Zonus) de Magnalis had written similar histories, and this discussion was obviously a regular *topos* in commentaries on *Eclogue* 6. It would be hard to prove that Benvenuto in his survey of the early Greek philosophers was influenced by the account either of Trevet or of Ciones. Trevet used Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* in compiling his survey, whereas Benvenuto used Aristotle’s *Physics*. Ciones was more dependent on Servius, from whose gloss on *Eclogue* 6.31 Trevet and Benvenuto felt free to depart and which they amplified.

At *Eclogue* 6.41 Benvenuto explains that after the creation the dissolution of things followed, caused by great floods. Deucalion and Pyrrha by the throwing of stones behind their back repeopled the earth. Benvenuto questions the placing of the reign of Saturn after the flood and suggests that the poet speaks ironically, since the age of gold had ended and the iron age was beginning.¹¹²

With the phrase “Sanctius his animal” (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.76, “a living creature nobler than these [wild beasts and birds]”) the commentator introduces the subject of the creation of man by Prometheus (*Eclogue* 6.42). It was an incomplete creation, however, as Benvenuto explains, for the man created by Prometheus was inanimate. Into this man life was brought with the

¹¹² For the Latin text, see Appendix 2, item 11 A.

help of Minerva through the theft of a spark of fire from the sun. Benvenuto declares triumphantly that by means of this infusion, and not by the power of matter, life, *anima*, or the soul of man, was achieved by a god, a process consonant with the Faith!¹¹³

To *Recollectio B* is owed the full sweep of Benvenuto's rhetoric, but the spare style of reporting characteristic of *Recollectio A* is capable of a telling phrase, such as the effective conclusion to this portion of the Prometheus episode:

Man's body is generated from the elements, and especially from earth, but his mind comes from beyond the earth, that is from heaven.¹¹⁴

That *anima* in this context means "mind" rather than "soul" is the contribution of *Recollectio C*, which reads more fully,

The body of man is generated and fabricated from the elements, but his rational mind comes from beyond (the earth), that is, from heaven.¹¹⁵

Benvenuto tells at some length the story of Prometheus's punishment of being bound to the Mons Caucasus by Jove for the theft of fire. He then concludes at *Eclogue* 6.44 what is Virgil's very brief treatment of this portion of Silenus's song in contrast to Benvenuto's more extended commentary on lines 41–44. Benvenuto relates the episode of Hercules' loss of his beloved companion Hylas, stolen by the nymphs of a fountain, during the expedition of Jason to obtain the golden fleece. The commentator enjoys a play on words by equating the sailors' cries for Hylas—"O Yla, Yla"—with the Greek word $\psi\lambda\eta$, the term for primal matter:

"Yla" is said to be primal matter. Aristotle says that primal matter is inborn and incorruptible. As a result it is unknown and unknowable, in such a way that this primal matter is very much unrecognized. Even though all those professing philosophy seek it, yet they do not find it.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ For the Latin text, see Appendix 2, item 11 B. See *Mythographus Vaticanus* III.10.9, in Bode in *Scriptores rerum mythicarum*, 1:227–28, for an account of how Minerva aided Prometheus in making man animate.

¹¹⁴ "Corpus hominis est generatum ex elementis et maxime ex terra sed anima uenit ab extra, scilicet a celo" (Cremona 109, fol. 25v).

¹¹⁵ "Corpus hominis est generatum et conflatum ex elementis sed anima rationalis uenit ab extra scilicet a celo" (Assisi 304, fol. 107ra).

¹¹⁶ "Yla dicitur quod est materia prima. Et dicit Aristoteles quod materia prima est ingenita et incorruptibilis. Et per consequens est ignota et incognoscibilis; ita quod ista materia prima est ualde incognita. Et licet omnes philosophantes querant eam, tamen non inueniunt" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 32rb; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 26r; Assisi 304, 107rb). For a discussion of some of the qualities of matter (*materia*), see *Aristoteles Latinus* VII.1.2, *Physica* 217a21–b15, pp. 168–69.

At *Eclogue* 6.45 Benvenuto sums up the previous lines of the poem, indicating that Silenus sang of material pertaining to the origin of the world according to the opinion of the Epicureans who contrived to have everything apply to the goal of pleasure. Now, he says, Virgil turns to myths or stories (*fabulae*) involving *voluptas*, pleasure, beginning notably with the myth of Pasiphae. Benvenuto is able to show most vividly how Pasiphae was the victim of *voluptas* in a very unnatural form, because of her love for the bull. He proceeds through the stories of the Proetides, Atalanta, and Phaeton, all illustrating in some fashion the results of *voluptas*.

With the commentary on *Eclogue* 6.64–70 Benvenuto has to direct his theme away somewhat from *voluptas* to represent love and poetry. The subject is the friend of Virgil, the poet, Gallus, who is honored in these lines in anticipation of *Eclogue* 10, which is devoted to him. Virgil's episode concerning Gallus is the vital core of *Eclogue* 6. Silenus depicts Gallus as wandering by the streams of the river Permessus, for one of the sister Muses led him to the Boeotian hills, and the Muse Calliope invested him with the skill of poetry. All the chorus of Apollo rose to do him honor. Although Benvenuto describes Gallus as experiencing “raging love” (*furious amor*), the emphasis is upon the gift of poetry bestowed upon him and the pipe of reeds upon which he learns the art of Hesiod and is urged to tell the origin of the Grynean grove. Benvenuto explains that the latter refers to Gallus's translation of the Greek poet Euphorion. The atmosphere surrounding Gallus, because of his unrequited love, is already turning elegiac. He is told to write of the Grynean grove so that there may be no grove in which Apollo takes greater pleasure.

The final section of *Eclogue* 6 reverts to more examples of *voluptas*. At line 74 Virgil asks, “Quid loquar aut Scyllam Nisi? . . .” (“Why should I tell either of Scylla, daughter of Nisus?”). The corollary to *aut* occurs in line 78 where the second *aut* introduces the story of Tereus, Procne, and Philomela. Benvenuto, however, is alert to the problem whereby at line 74 Virgil labels Scylla as the daughter of Nisus but proceeds to tell the myth regularly associated with Scylla, daughter of Phorcys. Benvenuto's reaction as expressed in *Recollectio B* is to say

This Eclogue offers more difficulty since Virgil here seems to say some false assertions against all truth and all fiction. . . . Virgil adds other stories containing other kinds of pleasures. And first he touches upon two stories, on one briefly and on another very briefly, of two Scyllas each of whom struggled with the disease of violent desire, and for each one of them it turned out badly. Behold: since the text is very confused, let us look, therefore, at both of them.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁷ “Ista Egloga . . . habet plus difficultatis quia Virgilius hic uidetur dicere aliqua falsa

Recollectio A prefaces the account of the two Scyllas somewhat more sympathetically toward Virgil:

Now consequently in this part he adds other stories similarly containing other kinds of pleasures. And notice that this reading is important since Virgil seems to say here some things that are false, but, nevertheless, he does not say them.¹¹⁸

Some modern editors explain that at times the story of Scylla, daughter of Phorcys, was conflated with that of Scylla, daughter of Nisus.¹¹⁹ Benvenuto solves the problem by narrating fully the stories of both Scyllas, beginning with Scylla, daughter of Nisus, as she is identified by Virgil. This Scylla's father, Nisus, king of Megara, had a golden lock of hair that guaranteed the safety of the city. Scylla, seeing Minos approaching by ship to attack Megara, fell in love with him. She betrayed her father by stealing his special lock of hair at night. She presented it to Minos, but he did not reciprocate her affections. After he had sacked Megara, she tried to join his departing ship, but he hurled her from the ship and she was turned into a lark.

By suggesting an emendation to the text whereby the words “Quid loquar?” were to be repeated, Benvenuto thus was able to proceed to narrate the story of Scylla, daughter of Phorcys. She was actually the Scylla described by Virgil in *Eclogue 6.74–77*. This Scylla was loved by Glaucus, but did not return his love. Glaucus then begged the enchantress Circe to cause Scylla to reciprocate his love. Circe, however, jealous because she was spurned by Glaucus, poisoned the pool where Scylla bathed and caused her lower limbs to be turned into wolves and barking dogs. Scylla then, becoming a monster, like Charybdis, harassed ships trying to navigate the straits of Messina. It was

contra omnem ueritatem et omnem fictionem. . . . Virgilius addit alias fabulas continentis alia genera uoluptatum. Et primo tangit duas fabulas, unam breviter, aliam brevissime, duarum S(cy)llarum quarum utraque laborauit morbo libidinis, et utrius male successit. Ecce quia litera est ualde confusa, uideamus ergo de utraque” (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 34ra; cf. Assisi 304, fol. 108va).

¹¹⁸ “Nunc consequenter in ista parte addit alias fabulas similiter continentis alia genera uoluptatum. Et aduertatis quod ista lectio est fortis quia Virgilius uidetur hic dicere aliqua falsa tamen non dicit” (Cremona 109, fol. 27r).

¹¹⁹ See *Vergil, Eclogues*, ed. Robert Coleman (Cambridge, 1977), 198–99; Clausen, *Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*, 204–5, who suggests that “Virgil was not nodding; he was concerned, rather, to tell one of the Scylla stories while reminding his reader of the other.” See also Gordon Williams, *The Nature of Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1970), 53–54, “Virgil mentions Scylla the monster (associated with Charybdis), but gives her the ancestry of Scylla the daughter of Nisus. He may well have invented this conflation of two well-known legends (though Hellenistic poets were fond of such inventions), but the purpose must have been to give Scylla, the notorious monster, the irreproachable home-life and love-affair of the daughter of Nisus—that is, to draw her too within the series of strange and tragic love-affairs.”

this Scylla who in *Odyssey* XII destroyed Odysseus's ship and his sailors and threatened his life.

Recollectio A rationalizes the story of Scylla, daughter of Nisus, by explaining that Nisus instead of a golden lock of hair, had a crown or treasure which could sustain the city of Megara as long as it lasted. It was this treasure that Scylla wished to give Minos against his will, as a result of which she was repulsed and was turned into a lark. Report *A* allegorizes the story of Scylla, daughter of Phorcys, by remarking that Glaucus is the libidinous man, who as *glaucus*, "gray-eyed," that is *lucus*, "one-eyed," is every dissolute person, looking back, slant-eyed and blindly.¹²⁰ Scylla is unsated and insatiable. Her prodigality devours and entices into danger many men of the world.¹²¹

In *Recollectio B* Benvenuto in telling the story supposedly of Scylla Nisi uses the figure of speech *occupatio*, "anticipation," to describe his method, akin to *praeteritio*, "preterition," by which, while seeming to remain silent about it, he actually narrates the story.¹²² After relating how Scylla, daughter of Phorcys, became the Scylla who threatened the life of Odysseus, *Recollectio B* allegorizes Odysseus as the wise man who knows how to avoid Scylla and to escape the lust that she represents.¹²³

Benvenuto says that he does not know whether the story of Odysseus escaping from Scylla of Scylla and Charybdis is true or not, but Homer wishes to show that a wise man knows how at times to avoid the kind of violent desire inherent in the story.

At *Eclogue* 6.78–81 Benvenuto tells the story of Tereus, Procne, and Philomela, whom he calls Thereus (or Terreus), Progne, and Philomena.¹²⁴ Benvenuto gives a full account of the myth, including its interpretation and an allegorization of the story. Ghisalberti presents Benvenuto's text of this material as found in Cremona 109 and remarks that the commentator writes an

¹²⁰ Cremona 109, fol. 27v: "Allegorice. Glaucus est vir libidinosus glaucus, id est lucus, et talis est omnis luxuriosus oblique respiciens et cece."

¹²¹ Ibid.: "Circa inguina uertitur in lupos et canes quia insaciata et insaciabilis efficitur. Ergo ipsa dicitur esse periculum maris inter Italiam et Siciliam scilicet in faro Mesanensi et navaientes per mundum periclitat. Hoc est dicere luxuria uorat et trahit in periculum multos homines mundi."

¹²² Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 34va: "Quid loquar aut Scyllam Nisi? Hic facit colorem rhetoricum qui uocatur *occupatio*, id est non oportet quod loquar quasi dicat tacite. Imo ualde loquar et non preteribo quin loquar."

¹²³ Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 34vb: "Omerus uult ostendere quod uir sapiens sicuti fuit Vlixes scit fugere et euitare S(c)yllam et istam libidinem *quam S(c)ylla[m] succincta[m] inguina, est fama uexasse rates Dulichias* id est naues Vlixis."

¹²⁴ For Benvenuto's Latin text of this myth and its allegorization, see Appendix 2, item 12 A.

interpretation of his own invention.¹²⁵ It cannot be, however, that Benvenuto's handling of this myth originated with him. In classical and in medieval literature there is lively interest in the myth, despite certain of its unpleasant aspects. In the earlier commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues* by Ciones (Zonus) de Magnalis one can find a similar treatment of the myth, including its allegorization.¹²⁶ A scrutiny of the two accounts, that of Ciones and of Benvenuto, indicates that although similar, these versions are far from identical in wording.¹²⁷ Given the popularity and wide dispersion of the myth, it is not likely that Benvenuto was dependent upon Ciones for his treatment of the story.

Tereus, king of Thrace, was married to Procne, daughter of Pandion, the king of Athens, who had given Procne to be wed to Tereus in return for his help to Pandion when he was besieged by barbarians. After a time Tereus planned a visit to Pandion, and Procne begged him to obtain Pandion's permission to allow her sister, Philomela, to return with Tereus so that the sisters could enjoy each other's company. Pandion, foolishly according to Benvenuto, permitted Philomela to leave with Tereus. The latter, captivated by Philomela's beauty, raped her on the way, stopping at a forest. Philomela, in great distress, threatened to announce to others what Tereus had done. His answer was to cut out her tongue and to send her into the forest to live in the midst of the huts of peasants. In time Philomela contrived to weave her story upon a garment or web and to send it to Procne in the city. Procne realized what had happened and surreptitiously located Philomela and brought her to a room of her home in the city where the sisters could lament together. A chance appearance of Itys, Procne's and Tereus's young son, suggested a terrible deed to Procne, namely to kill Itys and after cutting off the boy's head and feet, to cook him as a meal for Tereus. Tereus, seated in lone splendor at the dining table, unsuspectingly consumed his meal and then asked for Itys. Procne's answer was "The one you seek you have within." Thereupon Philomela, emerging from a room, threw Itys's head and feet at Tereus as proof of his dreadful meal. Immediately Tereus, reaching for his sword, pursued the sisters in order to kill them. Benvenuto observes that the story up to this point is true history. When Tereus was metamorphosed into a hoopoe, Procne into a swallow, and Philomela into a nightingale, then, according to Benvenuto, the story becomes a myth (*fabula*). Tereus stands for the body,

¹²⁵ Ghisalberti, *Le Chiose Virgiliane*, 31 (99): "Segue la favola di Tereo, Progne, e Filomena nella quale Benvenuto fa sfoggio di una anagogia di sua invenzione."

¹²⁶ For Ciones' presentation of the Tereus myth in *Eclogue* 6.78–81, see Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 5990, fol. 76ra, and Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria 1084, fols. 26v–27r, edited by Roberto Vianello (Tesi di Laurea 1979–80), 180–84.

¹²⁷ For the Latin text of the Tereus myth as presented by Ciones in Vat. lat. 5990, see Appendix 2, item 12 B.

(*corpus*), Pandion, “pan” (total) and “dyan” (clear) is the mind (*anima*), “totally clear.” Procne, as the older sister, is *concupiscentia*, “ardent desire,” which comes before *ratio*, “reason”, represented by Philomela. Benvenuto explains that the bird, hoopoe, which eats foul food, is appropriate for Tereus; Procne, as the swallow, hovers above the house; and Philomela, “sweetly singing,” frequents the solitude of the forest.

In *Eclogue* 6.78–81 Virgil omits any mention of Procne, and her name does not appear in the *Eclogue*. Thus in line 79 Virgil has Philomela prepare the meal for Tereus. At the end of Benvenuto’s presentation of the myth, he indulges in criticism of Virgil’s narration of the myth and takes the poet to task for having Philomela prepare the food for Tereus. He also points out that it is Procne who flew over the roofs of houses.

On an artistic level Benvenuto was attracted to Ovid’s lengthy and operatic account of the Tereus myth in *Metamorphoses* 6.424–674. When Tereus, unawares, has partaken of his ghastly meal, he asks to see his son Itys. To Ovid is owed the apt phrasing of Procne’s reply: “Intus habes, quem poscis” (“The one for whom you ask you have within”). Benvenuto repeats this statement, grimly effective in all its directness and brevity: “Quod petis intus habes.”¹²⁸

Benvenuto’s account of the Tereus myth, especially as set forth in *Recollec-tio B*, is considerably longer and more fully developed than the version in Servius, *In Buc.* 6.78. The vocabulary used by Benvenuto does not imitate that of Servius. The latter, for example, describes Tereus’s violation of Philomela thus: “dum adducit puellam, eam vitiavit in itinere et ei linguam, ne facinus indicaret, abscidit.” Benvenuto is more expansive and uses different vocabulary: “Et iste ducens eam exivit de navi iuxta quandam silvam. Et eam violavit et cognovit. Ista Phylomena dixit quod omnibus panderet qualiter ipse eam violaverit. Unde Thereus evulsit ei linguam.”

Benvenuto did not make use of the pathetic detail in Servius describing how Philomela’s story was depicted on the garment by means of her own blood: “Illa tamen rem in veste suo cruore descriptam misit sorori.” According to Benvenuto,

She came to the shepherds’ cottages and with great artistry embroidered a certain web on which she expressed in writing the whole monstrous misfortune that had happened to her and sent it to the city to her sister who was near Tereus’s city.

Servius in keeping with his purpose to present a brief sketch of the myth, proceeds immediately to the killing of Itys and the serving of this meal to his

¹²⁸ See Appendix 2, item 12A.

father, Tereus: "Qua cognita Procne Itym filium interemit et patri epulandum adposuit." The comparable part of Benvenuto's account reads

And meanwhile Ytis her son came into her room and she, maddened with contempt for her husband, killed their own son, and cooked him except for his feet and head and served him to Tereus to eat.

In contrast to the classical forms of the proper names in Servius, Benvenuto's text uses medieval forms. For the medieval orthography of the proper names in the Tereus myth Benvenuto probably depended on the version of the myth found in the Virgilian commentary attributed to Anselm of Laon, who lived in the late eleventh or early twelfth century.¹²⁹ In Anselm's account Benvenuto would have noted and imitated the spelling of Thereus for the Thracian king Tereus; Progne for the classical Procne; Philomena for Philomela, and Ytis for Itys. Yet here the similarity ends. Benvenuto's phrasing of the story itself differs radically from that of Anselm. The individuality of the two versions can be illustrated by setting side by side how each expresses a comparable stage of the narrative; for Anselm, London, British Library Add. 33220 is cited, and for Benvenuto, Ottob. lat. 1262:

Anselm

Progne in ultiōnem sororis sue et sui
ipsius Thereo marito suo Ytim filium
suum proprium comedendum apposuit.

Benvenuto

Illa (Progne) furiosa in despectum mariti
interfecit filium proprium et coquit eum
exceptis pedibus et capite et eum dedit
ad comedendum Thereo.

Another source of information about the myth of Tereus available to Benvenuto is *Mythographi Vaticani I* 4 (Tereus and Procne) and II.217 (Tereus), according to the edition of Bode.¹³⁰ In the more recent edition of Peter Kulcsar the myth is found in I.4 and II.261.¹³¹ According to Kathleen O. Elliott and J. P. Elder, *Mythographer I* was compiled during the Merovingian Age and *Mythographer II* belonged to the Carolingian period.¹³² Both *Mythographers* were heavily influenced by Servius, and this debt is readily observed in the

¹²⁹ See Christopher Baswell, *Virgil in Medieval England: Figuring the Aeneid from the Twelfth Century to Chaucer* (Cambridge, 1995), 63–68. I am indebted to the late Peter K. Marshall for suggesting that Anselm's Virgilian commentary may be a source for Benvenuto's treatment of the Tereus myth and for providing the transcription of a series of glosses from *Eclogue 6* from manuscripts of Anselm's Virgilian commentary. For Anselm's version of the Tereus myth, see Appendix 2, item 12C.

¹³⁰ See also Bode, *Scriptores rerum mythicarum* 2:6.

¹³¹ *Mythographi Vaticani I et II*, ed. Peter Kulcsar, CCL 91 (Turnhout, 1987), 4, 286.

¹³² Kathleen O. Elliott and J. P. Elder, "A Critical Edition of the *Vatican Mythographers*," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947): 198, 202. Note that *Mythographer III* does not contain an account of the myth of Tereus.

Mythographers' texts of the Tereus myth. It has been observed above that the phrasing of Servius does not coincide with Benvenuto's wording and thus the phrasing of the Mythographers I and II does not agree with Benvenuto's version. The Mythographers, however, could reinforce Benvenuto's orthography of the names Progne and Philomena, also of Tracum or Tracie without the letter *h*. Bode's note, "Codd. constanter Progne," is helpful in understanding this consistent usage in Benvenuto's manuscripts.¹³³

Fortified by sources ranging from Ovid to the Vatican Mythographers Benvenuto created a notable essay on the myth of Tereus which he used to amplify and vivify Virgil's literary allusions in *Eclogue 6*. Benvenuto's predecessors in relating the myth were often satisfied to write only a single paragraph. The Virgilian commentators, however, Ciones de Magnalis and Benvenuto da Imola, developed a literary piece, replete with vivid details and including an allegorization of the story for the reader's edification. Both Ciones (Zonus) and Benvenuto helped to lead the way from a medieval commonplace to a humanistic treatment of an old and essentially unappealing story. By means of carefully chosen details and a sense of human tragedy they fashioned a literary version worthy of adorning Virgil's own skillful four-line allusion in *Eclogue 6*.

At *Eclogue 6.82* Benvenuto in the words of *Recollectio A*, reaches a rather striking conclusion concerning the susceptibility to pleasure of wise men and even poets. He refers to the myth whereby Apollo underwent a period of serfdom to Admetus, king of Pherae, whose sheep the god was required to herd:

Now he concludes finally and says, "I recount several examples. Certainly I could tell an infinite number of evils that have happened as a result of pleasure." And so he says that Silenus sang all the things that Phoebus once persuaded him when, stripped of his divinity, he herded the flocks. And Apollo means to say that once when his divinity was lost, he was made a shepherd, that is, he was free for the indulgence of pleasure. This is to say that every most exalted wise man sometimes struggles with this disease of lust. Therefore look to see the text. Silenus sings ALL THE SONGS THAT THE BLESSED RIVER EUROTAS FORMERLY HEARD . . . he sings what Phoebus ORDERED HIS LAURELS LEARN, that is, learn by heart. That is, Apollo showed that even poets used to fall prey to this disease.¹³⁴

¹³³ Bode, *Notae criticae in Myth.* I.4, no. 20 (*Scriptores rerum mythicarum* 2:6).

¹³⁴ "Nunc concludit ultimo et dicit quod 'ego discurro per plura exempla. Certe ego possem infinita narrare de malis que contigerunt ex uoluptate.' Et ideo dicit quod iste Silenus cantauit omnia que olim Phebus persuasit quando spoliatus diuinitate pauit armenta. Et uult dicere Apollo aliquando dimissa diuinitate factus est pastor id est uacauit uoluptati. Hoc est dicere omnis summus sapiens laborat interdum isto morbo libidinis. Ergo uide literam. Et ille Silenus canit OMNIA QUE EUROTAS BEATUS AUDIIT CONDAM . . . ille canit que Phebus IUSSIT

To the end of *Eclogue* 6 Benvenuto maintains his emphasis on the dangers and tragic results of yielding to *voluptas*. Earlier in the poem in his discussion of Greek philosophy he had defined the *summum bonum* of the Epicureans as pleasure, and in his comments on the various myths sung by Silenus he had steadily kept *voluptas* in mind as the predominating force in the stories assembled by Virgil in this poem. A possible exception is Benvenuto's treatment, in the center of the Eclogue, of Virgil's friend Gallus. Here Benvenuto brings the poetry of Gallus to the fore and the elegiac nature of his unrequited love.

One might well ask whether Benvenuto's comments on *Eclogue* 6 show signs of advancing humanism or whether they lead back to more typically medieval attitudes and methods of criticism. Toward the beginning of his commentary on *Eclogue* 6, Benvenuto encountered some difficulties in his understanding of the poem. His problem of identifying the Varus to whom Virgil's poem is addressed, a problem questionably solved even by later critics, can readily be discounted. Benvenuto's practice, however, of assigning arbitrary and outlandish etymologies and meanings to the names of Virgil's characters is more troubling. Does his definition of the name Thalia as *capacitas* for example, or his interpretation of the name Pandion as *anima, tota clara*, really advance the reader's understanding of Virgil's poem? In this regard Benvenuto might answer that his purpose in expounding Virgil's *Eclogue* went beyond parsing its contents and was intended to provide moral instruction as well. His persistence in bringing Augustus into the discussion of the *Eclogue* and equating him with Apollo, a god important for the poem, is only disruptive. In spite of Benvenuto's admirable care to point out the slender, lean, and humble style of the *Eclogues*, he misinterprets Virgil's antithesis between *pinguis ovis* and *deductum carmen* in lines 4-5.

Balanced against these problems experienced by Benvenuto is his admirable quotation of classical authorities relevant to the interpretation of the *Eclogue*. These citations indicate Benvenuto's advanced knowledge of classical Latin literature and of some Greek authors, such as Homer, Hesiod, and Aristotle, in Latin translation. *Recollectio B*, the most expansive of the three versions of Benvenuto's lectures on *Eclogue* 6, contains fifteen citations of classical authors, including Homer, Hesiod, Aristotle, Cicero, Horace, Livy, Ovid (eight citations), and Seneca. In this same report of *Eclogue* 6 there are eleven citations of later authors such as Macrobius (four citations), Boethius, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory. In addition Benvenuto cites Servius in six

LAUROS EDISCERE id est perfecte discere. Hoc est Apollo ostendit quod etiam poete incidebant morbum istum" (Cremona 109, fol. 28r; Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 35rb; Assisi 304 lacks this comment; see Basel F V 49, fol. 28rb).

references, all of them strongly negative. *Recollectio A*, considerably shorter than *Recollectio B*, and much more concise, offers eleven citations of classical and late antique authors, drawn from the same sources as in *B*, including three citations from Ovid and three from Macrobius. *Recollectio A* agrees with *B* in criticizing six glosses by Servius.

A positive and forward-looking aspect of Benvenuto's commentary on *Eclogue 6* is his care in outlining the history of early Greek philosophy. He was not content simply to follow Servius's gloss on *Eclogue 6.31*, although he made use of elements in Servius's note. More important is Benvenuto's familiarity with Aristotle's *Physics*, which he knew well from Latin translation, not only from the beginning of that work but well into book 4. Benvenuto's precise use of Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* is less certain, but he obviously was well enough acquainted with this work to refer to it with some confidence. A sign of Benvenuto's keen observation of Virgil's text is his alertness to the problem of the poet's labeling of Scylla as the daughter of Nisus when the mythological information related describes Scylla, daughter of Phorcys. He was sufficiently meticulous to suggest an emendation to the text and to narrate the story belonging to each Scylla. In the case of Scylla, daughter of Phorcys, he was able to indicate in what book of Homer's *Odyssey* this Scylla occurred. Although Benvenuto was careful to elucidate and to dwell upon the moral lesson to be derived from the myths that belonged to Silenus's song, he was equally comfortable in explaining scholarly issues pertaining to *Eclogue 6*.

Eclogue 8.

Even as Benvenuto's final choice in *Eclogue 4*, after the consideration of many alternatives, was one based on Roman practice rather than on Christian belief, so also at *Eclogue 8.73–74*, he gave a secular interpretation to Virgil's lines. With the mention of the three threads of three different hues that were to be bound into a knot to help restore the errant Daphnis's affections, Benvenuto's matter-of-fact attitude is apparent. *Recollectio A* reports the gloss:

THESE THREE THREADS and you can understand that he speaks here of the Trinity just as many wish. Nevertheless I believe that this is not characteristic of the mind of the author since he was a pagan.¹³⁵

¹³⁵ “HEC TERNA LICIA et potes intelligere quod loquatur de Trinitate sicuti multi volunt, tamen credo quod non sit de mente autoris quia paganus fuit” (Cremona 109, fol. 35r). Cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 44vb: “TERNA LICIA id est tria fila. Et dicit TERNA numerus ternarius est perfectus. Et sic mulierculae dicunt quod omnia ista incantamina sua faciunt fieri ter, et omnia ponunt in numero ternario. Aristoteles etiam dicit numero ternario solemus glorificare deos.

Also in the commentary on *Eclogue* 8 Benvenuto took a firm stand on the issue whether Virgil is to be regarded as a magician. There is no doubt that in fashioning Alphesiboeus's song, Virgil knew that he was describing magical rites. He used the words "magicis . . . sacris" to indicate the means by which the woman, unnamed in the song, would try to soften her lover's all too indifferent feelings. Yet Virgil's skill in depicting magical devices did not mean that he himself believed in them. At *Eclogue* 8.64 Benvenuto argues in a humanistic vein, denying quite definitely that Virgil was advancing the doctrine of magic:

Many excellent critics all seem to agree that here Virgil advocates a doctrine of magical art, an opinion which seems to me to be very ridiculous, since here Virgil teaches no magical art inasmuch as he puts forward nothing except trifles that old wives tell all day long. But these critics do not consider that the author is drawing upon his artistic skill.¹³⁶

This view is confirmed later at *Eclogue* 8.95–96 when Benvenuto refutes the opinion of Servius that Virgil was a *magus*. He repeats his previous arguments, again attributing the practices described in the *Eclogue* to feminine quibbles or trickery.

He approaches another kind of sacrifice and magic incantation. And I wish to speak against Servius, who says that these are magic rites. And as I said (in my lecture) yesterday, these are trifles and feminine trickeries since he says nothing concerning magic. If you wish to consider Lucan when he speaks about Erichtho, he says more about magic than Virgil does.¹³⁷ And yet these are trickeries and he was not a magician, and all poets and laws deplore this magic.¹³⁸

Aliqui voluerunt quod Virgilius intelligeret de Trinitate. Non est verum sed ut dixi numerus ternarius est perfectus, quia significat principium, medium et finem." See also Assisi 304, fol. 116va.

¹³⁶ "Multi excellentes omnes consentire uidentur quod hic Virgilius tradat doctrinam artis magice, quod michi uidetur multum ridiculous, quia nullam hic Virgilius docet artem magica quia non ponit nisi quedam trufamina quibus utunt tota die uetule, sed non considerant artem autoris" (Cremona 109, fol. 34v; cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 44ra; Assisi 304, fol. 116ra).

¹³⁷ Here Benvenuto refers to the Thessalian witch Erichtho, who is consulted by Sextus Pompey in Lucan's *De bello civili*, book 6. For a description of her dreadful practices, see especially Lucan, 6.507–68.

¹³⁸ "Agreditur aliud genus sacrificii et incantationis magice. Et uolo dicere contra Seruium qui dicit quod hec sunt magica. Et ut dixi heri ista sunt trufatoria et muliebria quia nichil dicit de magica. Si uultis considerare Luc quando loquitur de Rythoe [sic] plus dicit de magica quam Virgilius. Et tamen trufatoria, et ipse non fuit magicus et omnes poete et leges detestantur istam magicam" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 45vb; Cremona 109, fol. 36r; Assisi 304, fol. 117rb).

Ghisalberti in a note to his remarks on Benvenuto's commentary on *Eclogue 8* reports that in his Dante commentary Benvenuto is rather less decisive about Virgil as a magician than he is in the Virgil commentary.¹³⁹ In his commentary on Dante's *Inferno*, Canto 1, when discussing lines 100–105, Benvenuto says in connection with *Eclogue 4.6–7*,

And perchance since Virgil was a great astrologer, and lived a little before the coming of Christ, he could have foreseen His nativity and the good fortune of that time.¹⁴⁰

It is possible that in his Dante commentary Benvenuto was influenced by the fact that Boccaccio, whose lectures on Dante he had heard, believed that Virgil was a magician.¹⁴¹ Benvenuto's precursor in Virgilian exegesis, Ciones (Zonus) de Magnalis, also admitted that Virgil was a magician, and his views may have occurred to Benvenuto when the latter was writing his Dante commentary.¹⁴² Although Benvenuto worked on his Dante and his Virgilian commentaries at the same period of his life, his denial in the Virgilian commentary that Virgil was a magician could have been a somewhat later and more carefully considered opinion than he was prepared to express early in the Dante commentary.

Eclogue 10.

In launching upon his commentary on the final poem of Virgil's *Bucolics*, Benvenuto points to an important difference between this last poem and its predecessors. As he observes in contrasting *Eclogue 10* with the previous poem, *Eclogue 9* lamented the poet's ill fortune concerning his property under the guise of another person.¹⁴³ The tenth and last *Eclogue*, however, laments the ill fortune of Virgil's friend, Gallus, in his own person.¹⁴⁴ *Recollectio B*

¹³⁹ Ghisalberti, *Le Chiose Virgiliane*, 36 (104) n. 1.

¹⁴⁰ "Et forte quia Virgilius fuit magnus astrologus, et fuit parum ante adventum Christi, potuit praevidisse nativitatem ejus, et felicitatem illius temporis" (Lacaita, *Comentum* 1:56).

¹⁴¹ See Giovanni Boccaccio, *Il Comento alla Divina Commedia e gli altri scritti intorno a Dante*, ed. Domenico Guerri, vol. 3 (Bari, 1918), 6–8. Cf. Zabughin, *Vergilio nel Rinascimento italiano* (n. 13 above), 1:46 and n. 218, 91–92. See Dante, *Inferno* 9.23.

¹⁴² Zabughin, *Vergilio nel Rinascimento italiano*, 46–47, and *L'Arcadia* 1:9 and 17 nn. 58–60.

¹⁴³ "Vergilius deplorauit suam infelicitatem circa bona sua sub persona alterius" (Cremona 109, fol. 39r; Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 49vb; Assisi 304, fol. 120va). In the commentary on *Eclogue 10*, *Recollectio C*, represented by the Assisi manuscript, follows *Recollectio B* with few changes in the text.

¹⁴⁴ "Nunc in ista decima et ultima egloga deplorat infelicitatem optimi amici sui uidelicet Galli circa eius persona" (Cremona 109, fol. 39r; cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fols. 49vb–50ra and Assisi 304, fol. 120va).

sharpens the contrast by setting forth a vital aspect of the difference in Virgil's method:

He speaks in his own person without the introduction of any shepherd. Thus he changes the style of the poem.¹⁴⁵

Shepherds, although mentioned in lines 19, 36, and 51, play no role in *Eclogue* 10. Virgil has shifted from the pastoral to the elegiac mode, where the emphasis is upon the unrequited love of his friend, Gallus.

The reader is also told early in the commentary that Gallus's ultimate fate was a tragic one. Citing Suetonius's *Vita Divi Augusti* (chap. 66) Benvenuto explains that Augustus elevated Gallus from an impoverished state by making him a member of his own household and further by appointing him prefect of the new province of Egypt, established after the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra.¹⁴⁶ Gallus, however, committed some kind of wrong and therefore was expelled from the Emperor's household and from the province. He finally was condemned to death by the Senate. The personal nature of this tragedy is emphasized by the fact that Augustus wept after Gallus's death. The friendship of Virgil and Gallus is vital, for Gallus, also a poet, was a promoter of Virgil to the favor of Augustus.

The *Eclogue*, according to Benvenuto, consists of two main parts, *prohemium et tractatus*, an introduction and a treatise or narrative. In the *prohemium* the poet invokes the Sicilian or Theocritan Muse, Arethusa, and asks her permission to sing some verses for Gallus: "pauca meo Gallo . . . carmina" (10.2-3). The commentator briefly relates the story, based on Ovid, of Arethusa, loved by the river Alpheus, who pursued her from Pisa in Greece all the way under the sea to Sicily.¹⁴⁷ To escape his love, she was turned into a fountain. Since Gallus wished for the requital of his love, something contrary to Arethusa's wishes for herself, it was necessary for the poet to ask for her license or permission to dedicate verses for his friend.

The *tractatus* or body of the *Eclogue* begins at line 9 with all nature grieving with Gallus as he lay beneath a lonely rock—"sola sub rupe iacentem" (10.14); Benvenuto adds, ". . . id est in studiolo suo" ("in his study").¹⁴⁸ The shepherd and the swineherd came, concerned about his love. Apollo, Silvanus, and Pan also came to ask if there could be any limit to his sorrow. Benvenuto describes how all those absent came to console Gallus, and he tells the response of Virgil:

¹⁴⁵ "Loquitur per se sine introductione alicuius pastoris. Ita quod uariat stilum" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 50ra).

¹⁴⁶ Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 50ra; Cremona 109, fol. 39r,v; Assisi 304, fol. 120vb.

¹⁴⁷ See Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 5.572-641 and *Ex Ponto* 2.10.27-28.

¹⁴⁸ Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 50vb; Cremona 109, fol. 40r; Assisi 304, fol. 121rb.

Virgil intends to show all the grief caused when a man of (Gallus's) wisdom incurs such frenzy.¹⁴⁹

The commentator follows his usual bent in equating Apollo with Augustus:

But Apollo also came. And he is Augustus, who grieves over his (Gallus's) wretchedness. And see how he addresses him like a member of his family. And he reports that Apollo SAID, that is spoke, O GALLUS WHY ARE YOU LIKE ONE WITHOUT REASON? He shows that it had been madness on the part of Lycoris. Your friend, YOUR LOVED ONE, (an appositive,) that is one who is completely your concern, has followed (another), has withdrawn, has renounced you.¹⁵⁰

Gallus answers at line 31, expressing his desire that (in the words of Benvenuto) the Arcadians will sing of his love.

And so Gallus interrupted by these gods thus began to speak, "YOU WILL SING, ARCADIANS." Gallus said, "I rejoice for one reason only, since you will sing of this love." Therefore he said, "O Arcadian shepherds," that is, "O you good poets, YOU WILL SING THIS STORY IN YOUR MOUNTAINS since you are Arcadians. YOU ALONE are SKILLED IN SINGING. AS FOR ME," as if to say, "since I cannot have consolation in life, at least after death I may find peace if it should fall to you to tell of my loves. OH, HOW GENTLY MY BONES WOULD REST IF YOUR PIPE SHOULD SING OF MY LOVES."¹⁵¹

At *Eclogue 10.35–36* Benvenuto enumerates the longings that he imagines Gallus as having expressed, such as "utinam fuissem custos gregis uestri" ("would that I had been the keeper of your herd"), that is, "custos poematis uestri" ("the guardian of your poetry"), or "utinam fuissem uester scolaris et studuisse in studiolo uestro, et nunquam petuisse curias dominorum" ("would that I had been your pupil and had studied in your school and had

¹⁴⁹ "Virgilius uult ostendere quantum sit dolendum de sapiente incurrente ad tantam dementiam" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 50vb).

¹⁵⁰ "Sed etiam Apollo uenit. Et iste est Augustus qui dolet de eius desolatione. Et ecce quod alloquitur eum familiaris. Et dicit ille Apollo INQUIT (10.22) id est dixit o GALLE QUID INSANIS? Probat quod fuerat insania ex parte eius Lycoris. Amica tua CURA TUA, appositiue, id est que est tota tua cura EST SECUTA (alium) recessit, dimisit te" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 51ra; Cremona 109, fol. 40r; Assisi 304, fol. 121va).

¹⁵¹ "Iste Gallus ita interpellatus ab istis diis sic cepit loqui CANTABITIS ARCADES. Dicebat iste Gallus, 'Ego de uno solo letor quia uos cantabitis hunc amorem.' Ergo inquit, "O pastores Archades,' id est 'O uos boni poete uos cantabitis HEC (IN) VESTRIS MONTIBUS quia uos Arcades estis SOLI PERITI CANTARE. O MIHI' quasi dicat 'ex quo non possum habere consolationem in uita, saltem post mortem inueniam quietem si contigerit uos cantare meos amores. . . . O QUAM pro quantum OSSA MEA QUIESCANT MOLLITER SI VESTRA FISTULA (DECANTET) MEOS AMORES'" (Cremona 109, fol. 40r; cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 51rb; Assisi 304, fol. 121vb).

never sought the councils of nobles").¹⁵² Benvenuto buttresses Gallus's wish by two rather vivid *exempla*. He first cites Seneca, who mourned that he ever left exile in Corsica for the hazards of Nero's court in Rome:

And thus Seneca says concerning his own self that he wished he had never left the island of Corsica where many poets lived, since when recalled to Rome, he met a tragic end.¹⁵³

For his second example, a notable instance of the abandonment of a more rural way of life in Vaucluse for one more sophisticated in Italy, with hope of advancement in Rome, Benvenuto refers to Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen* 8.¹⁵⁴ In this poem Petrarch abandons his service to Cardinal Giovanni Colonna and prepares to leave Vaucluse for Italy, where he seems to have aspirations of sharing in the regime of Cola di Rienzi.¹⁵⁵ In Petrarch's *Egloga* 8 Benvenuto saw a contrast between the woods (*silua*) of Vaucluse and the lure of Italy, similar to Gallus's wish that he had been a solitary figure in the woods rather than a courtier in the city.

At Petrarch's *Egloga* 8.69, Amyclas, allegorically representing Petrarch, answers the charge of Ganymede, representing Cardinal Colonna, that Petrarch scorns the trust of friends who were long loyal to him: "Nil spretum, nisi silua ferox pastorque proteruus" ("Nothing is scorned except a wild forest and a haughty shepherd," i.e., the Pope). Benvenuto in his commentary on Petrarch's *Egloga* 8, explains this passage:

I have scorned nothing except Avignon, a wild city, and Pope Clement, and a land producing the worst poisons and a very fierce wind.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵² Concluding these regrets of Gallus for his error in courting the halls of power in Rome, Benvenuto notes, "Gallus optauit se fuisse potius solitarium in siluis quam curiale in urbibus" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 51va; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 40r-v; Assisi 304, fol. 122ra).

¹⁵³ "Et sic Seneca dicit de se ipso quod numquam vellet recessisse a Corsica insula ubi multi habitabant poete, quia Seneca reuocatus ad urbem fecit malum finem" (for the reading *multi*, where Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 51va reads *multum*, see Basel F V 49 at *Eclogue* 10.40, fol. 41ra).

¹⁵⁴ *Recollectio A* correctly cites Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen* 8 (Cremona 109, fol. 40v; cf. London, British Library Add. 10095, fol. 41ra): "Et adverte quod Petrarca in .viii.a epistula dicit quod iste Gallus dedit exemplum ne poete sequerentur curias." Since *Recollectio C* follows the text of *Recollectio B* in *Eclogue* 10, there are four manuscripts (Ottob. lat. 1262; Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. class. c.9; Assisi 304; and Basel F V 49) that incorrectly refer to Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen* 9. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 51va, reads "Unde Petrarca in egloga nona ubi fere numerat omnes poetas, dicit quod Gallus infelicitate sua dedit exemplum aliis ut fugerent curias."

¹⁵⁵ *Francesco Petrarca: Bucolicum carmen, Octave eglogue titulus: Divortium, in Il Bucolicum carmen e i suoi commenti inediti*, ed. Antonio Avena (Padua, 1906; rpt. Bologna, 1969), 132-36.

¹⁵⁶ "Nil spreui nisi Aduinione, ciuitatem ferocem, et papam Clementem et terram generan-

That Benvenuto would gloss *silua ferox* at Petrarch's *Egloga* 8.69 as "Adiunione, ciuitatem ferocem" ("Avignon, a wild city"), thus defining *silua* as *ciuitas* might come as a surprise unless one is aware of Benvenuto's remarks earlier on Virgil's *Eclogue* 1.5:

THE WOODS RESOUND. . . . Likewise the aforementioned Petrarch in his book of *Bucolics* by "woods" understands cities, by "flocks" understands "people," by "herds" understands "men who can learn by being taught."¹⁵⁷

The immediately preceding gloss, however, at Virgil's *Eclogue* 1.5, would suggest that Petrarch sometimes intended *silva* to keep its meaning as "woods:"

THE WOODS RESOUND, that is, by means of poetic song, as Petrarch says, "The woods delight in the Muses. The city is hostile to poets."¹⁵⁸

When Petrarch writes to his brother, Gherardo, to explain the allegory in *Bucolicum Carmen* 1, he explains that the name Silvius refers to himself:

This is the meaning of what I intend. We are shepherds engaged in conversation: I am Silvius, you are Monicus. The following is the reason for the names. The meaning of the first then is that the situation takes place in the woods; second, then, is that hatred for the city and love of the woods were instilled in me from early youth, because of which many of our friends in every conversation more often call me "Silvanus" rather than "Franciscus."¹⁵⁹

tem uenena pessima et tristissimum uentum." For Benvenuto's comment on *Egloga* 8, see Avena, *Commenti inediti*, Section II, Benvenuto da Imola, *Egloga* 8, pp. 223–25 (225 for this passage). See also Petrarch's *Bucolicum Carmen*, translated and annotated by Thomas G. Bergin (New Haven, 1974), 114–27, notes to *Eclogue* 8, Separation, pp. 231–34.

¹⁵⁷ "SILVAS RESONARE. . . . Item dictus Petrarca in libro *Bucolico(rum)* per siluas intelligit ciuitates, per greges intelligit populum, per pecudes intelligit homines disciplinabiles" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 1va; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 1v; Assisi 304, fol. 84rb). Cf. Petrarch, *Epistola* 10.4.21: "Rus ac gregem, quorum sprevisse curam dicitur, pro civitate et hominibus intellige, quos in solitudinem fugiens reliquisti" (ed. Giuseppe Fracassetti, *Epistolae De rebus familiaribus*, 3 vols. [Florence, 1859–63], 2:88). See also Petrarch, *Bucolicum Carmen* 1.1–3, ed. Avena, *Il Bucolicum Carmen*, 95 (and 247 for the commentary on Petrarch's *Bucolicum Carmen* 1 by Francesco Piendibeni da Montepulciano: "Vel Silvius et Silva, idest civitate, nam silva pro civitate per totum istud opus debet intelligi").

¹⁵⁸ "SILVAS RESONARE id est per cantum poeticum, ut ait Petrarca: 'Gaudet silua Musis. Urbs est inimica poetis.'" See Petrarch, *Secretum* 2: "Sylva placet Musis, urbs est inimica poetis" (ed. G. Martellotti et al., *Prose* [Milan, 1955], 120); also *Epistolae metricae* 2.3.43, in *Opera que extant omnia* (Basel, 1554), 1344, col. 2.

¹⁵⁹ "Intentionis autem meae sensus hic est. Nominum ratio haec est: primi quidem tum, quia in silvis res acta est, tum propter insitum ab ineunte aetate urbis odium amoremque siluarum, propter quem multi ex nostris in omni sermone saepius me Siluanum quam Franciscum vocant" (Petrarch, *Epistola* 10.4, in *De rebus familiaribus*, ed. Fracassetti, 2:87–88).

In this passage, there can be no doubt that the name *Silvius* for Petrarch is associated with the woods, in the primary sylvan sense of this word. Yet, once this explanation is set forth in the letter, Petrarch feels free to use *silva* or the word *rus* in his own special sense of *civitas*.¹⁶⁰

Both in Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 and in Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen* 1 and 8, *silvae* provide a sympathetic setting for the poets Gallus and Petrarch. In *Eclogue* 10 Virgil declares, as early as line 8, "Non canimus surdis, respondent omnia siluae" ("We do not sing to deaf ears, the woods respond to every note"). Throughout *Eclogue* 10, one finds a back-drop and an impressive array of woods and trees: *uirgulta* ("copse," 10.7); *siluae* (10.8, 52, 63); *nemora* ("groves," 10.9, 43); *saltus* ("woodlands," 10.9, 57); *lauri* ("bay-trees," 10.13); *myricae* ("tamarisks," 10.13); *pinifer . . . Maenalus* ("pine-bearing Mt. Maenalus," 10.14–15); *Siluanus* ("the god of woods," 10.24); *ebuli* ("dwarf-elder," 10.27); *salices* ("willows," 10.40); *arbores* (10.54); *lucus* ("groves," 10.58); *Hamadryades* ("wood-nymphs," 10.62); *ulmus* ("elm," 10.67); *alnus* ("alder," 10.74); and *iuniperus* ("juniper" 10.76). At 10.52–53 Gallus is determined to carve the story of his love on the tender, young trees, and at 10.63 he bids farewell once again to the woods: "ipsae rursus concedite siluae."

Likewise Petrarch repeatedly invokes his love of the woods, and for good reason assumes the name *Silvius* to indicate his innermost values. At his *Egloga* 8.94 Petrarch pays tribute to Virgil's *Eclogue* 5.13–14 when he has Ganymede (Cardinal Giovanni Colonna) direct the question to Amyclas (Petrarch):

Whom will you find, hapless one, to hear your song with approval?
Who will inscribe your verses on the light and delicate laurel?"¹⁶¹

Petrarch in his writings not only provides a wealth of such comparative references to his wide and careful reading but also serves through his own works as a source of comment for others. Likewise Benvenuto again and again has proved himself alert to these mutually illuminating exchanges between authors.

It is Benvenuto's purpose in his commentary on Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 to clarify the poet's lines by means of paraphrasing them, a method that occupies much of the commentary. He also indicates his sympathetic understanding of

¹⁶⁰ Ibid. (a few lines below Petrarch's explanation of the name *Silvius*): "Rus ac gregem . . . pro civitate et hominibus intellige" (see n. 157 above).

¹⁶¹ "Ah! miser. Et merita quis te cum laude canentem / Audiet, aut levi describet carmina lauro?" (Petrarch, *Bucolicum carmen* 8.93–94, trans. Bergin). See Bergin's note on these lines in *Petrarch's Bucolicum carmen*, 234, referring to Virgil, *Eclogue* 5.13–14 (concerning writing on the bark of the beech tree). Cf. Virgil, *Eclogue* 10.52–54 for the theme of Gallus's carving his love on trees.

Gallus's pangs of unrequited love for Lycoris and his moods that shift from moment to moment. The commentary on lines 10.44–46 will illustrate Benvenuto's method of portraying Gallus's agitated thoughts:

NOW A MAD (love). It confirms what he said. And he proves it by explaining the outcome of the affair, and he speaks as a lover, as if to say, "Do you intend to see if I have true affection for you?" He says, "Even though such a great distance separates us one from the other, nonetheless I am always joined to you in my thoughts. Therefore, NOW A MAD LOVE that drives me out of my mind DETAINS ME." And where? "IN THE ARMS OF THE HARSH GOD OF WAR," that is, in the fields where the arms of war are plied. And in what? "IN THE MIDST OF ARMS," that is, weapons. "ALSO AMONG THE OPPOSING ENEMY of the Roman empire, in that I take my stand with my mind in Antony's war since you are there. You are FAR FROM YOUR NATIVE LAND," as if to say, "I am bodily separated from you but not in my thoughts. Yet you are always separated from me both in mind and body." And he speaks like a lover. "LET IT NOT BE RIGHT FOR ME TO BELIEVE SUCH A STORY," namely, that this is so far away, as if to say, "Even though you are separated from me in mind and body, yet the thought does not occur to my mind that you are so far away."¹⁶²

This passage, purposely disjointed, conveys the mental and emotional confusion suffered by Gallus. The several interrogatives that Benvenuto introduces add to Gallus's feelings of uncertainty and help to express his insecurity. He reaches the conclusion that Lycoris is alienated from him in mind and body, but in a burst of vain hope, he declares that he cannot believe that she is far away from him. Benvenuto by his own rhetorical devices enters into the spirit of Virgil's utterance, "omnia uincit Amor" ("Love conquers all things") as it applies both to Gallus's love for Lycoris and to Virgil's deep feeling in turn for Gallus.

Several citations of authors or specific glosses that occur in one *recollectio* but not in another in Benvenuto's commentary on Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 point to the likelihood that *Recollectio A* and *Recollectio B* represent different lectures

¹⁶² "NUNC INSANUS. Confirmat quod dixit. Et probat per euentum rei et dicit tanquam amans quasi dicat 'Vis tu uidere si habeo erga te affectionem?' Dicit 'Licet tanta distantia separat nos ab inuicem nichilominus semper sum coniunctus tibi cum mente. Ergo NUNC INSANUS AMOR qui facit me insanum DETINET ME.' Et ubi? "IN ARMIS MARTIS DURI" id est in campus ubi exercentur arma martialis. Et in quo? "INTER TELA MEDIA" id est arma, "ATQUE . . . INTER HOSTES ADVERSOS Romani imperii, quia sto cum animo in bello Antonii quia ibi es. TU PROCUL A PATRIA scilicet es" quasi dicat "Ego sum diuinus a te corporaliter et mente non, et es semper diuisa a me mente et corpore." Et loquitur tanquam amans. "NEC SIT" supple fas "MIHI CREDERE TANTUM" scilicet hoc esse procul quasi dicat "Licet sis separata a me mente et corpore, tamen non cadit in mente mea quod sis tam procul" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 51va-b; Cremona 109, fol. 40v; Assisi 304, fol. 122ra-b). For the phrase "in armis maris duri" *Recollectiones B* and *C* read "in arvis martis duri."

by Benvenuto. *Recollectio C* in *Eclogue* 10, as in several other earlier *Eclogues*, is based on *Recollectio B* and seldom varies from it. At *Eclogue* 10.27, for example, in *A* but not in *B* or *C*, the phrase “minioque rubentem” is glossed by the fitting information “minius est ille color quo scribuntur literae capitales librorum (“vermilion is the color in which the capital letters of books are written”). At the end of the commentary at *Eclogue* 10.76, “umbra iuniperi,” *Recollectio A* refers to Boccaccio, whereas *Recollectiones B* and *C* refer to Holy Scripture:

And note that here Virgil speaks the truth that too much leisure time for study is harmful for students. And truly too much free time for study was fatal for master Giovanni Boccaccio since he devoted himself so thoroughly to study that, being heavy in weight, he destroyed himself since he had an overabundance of different humors (*Recollectio A*);

It is said in Holy Scripture that a certain person was made heavy (filled with sleep) in the shade of a juniper tree (*Recollectiones B* and *C*).¹⁶³

The reference is to 1 Kings 19. The person is Elijah, who to escape danger in Israel went into the wilderness and sat under a juniper tree. He prayed to the Lord to take away his unworthy life. (19:4). He then lay down and fell asleep under the juniper tree. An angel touched him and told him to arise and eat. (19:5). A cake and a pitcher of water were miraculously provided, and he lay down again. A second time the angel told him to eat, for otherwise the journey would be too great for him. Fortified by the food and rest, Elijah after forty days and nights reached Horeb, the holy mountain of Moses (19:6–8).

Virgil, Benvenuto, and the book of 1 Kings agree on the soporific nature of the shade of the juniper tree, but Virgil, as emphasized by Benvenuto, points to the danger of the juniper’s shade to poet singers. The shade of trees is harmful also to crops, and, Benvenuto adds, how much more harmful to men! Holy Scripture, however, has a different message and tells of the physical comfort and beneficence of the juniper’s shade to Elijah.

In *Recollectiones B* and *C* there is another striking gloss near the end of the commentary, absent from *Recollectio A*. After Gallus concludes his despairing speech with the pronouncement, “omnia uincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori” (10.69). *Recollectio B* in a graceful observation prepares for the conclusion of *Eclogue* 10 and of Virgil’s book of *Eclogues*:

¹⁶³ “Et aduerte quod hic Virgilii dicit uerum quod nimium ocium in studio nocet studientibus. Et uere nimium ocium studii destruxit dominum Johannem Bucatium, quia in tantum dedit se ocio studii quod ipse qui erat pinguis multum destruxit se quia humores diuersi superabundarunt” (Cremona 109, fol. 41v); “Dicitur in Sacra Scriptura quod quidam factus est grauis ad umbram iuniperi” (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 52vb; Assisi 304, fol. 123ra).

LOVE CONQUERS ALL THINGS, LET US ALSO YIELD TO LOVE. . . . Here ends Gallus's complaint. Virgil, now making an end to this book of the *Bucolics* speaks. He invokes the Muses and excuses himself for not proceeding further, since a brief discourse succeeds in reaching heaven, as if to say, "I have produced a small volume, but one that is weighty."¹⁶⁴

Benvenuto concludes his commentary on Virgil's pastoral poems with homage to the last line of *Eclogue* 10: and at the same time with an eye on his own efforts:

See how the poet concludes in outstanding fashion. GO HOME. He had made his apologies to the Muses. Now he releases his goats, since, as you know, in the evening the goats are accustomed to be led home. O GOATS, that is, my *Eclogues*. GO HOME, depart from my study, since you are WELL FED, that is, perfected. GO FORTH, namely, to the public. EVENING COMES, that is, the hour is late and I have finished my task. And in this way the complete work of the *Bucolics* is brought to an end.¹⁶⁵

Fittingly Benvenuto brings to a conclusion the pastoral care of the goats, which are symbolic of the poems that form the very subject of the book. The elegiac treatment of Gallus and his poetry provide the appropriate tone of the commentary on *Eclogue* 10, but the pastoral mood of the book of the *Eclogues* as a whole is maintained until the very end of Benvenuto's treatise. The commentator's powers of observation and of poetic sensitivity have been heightened in the process, calling forth the reader's attention and his increased appreciation of Virgil's poems. Furthermore, this process has depended on such matters as fidelity to the text of Virgil, increased knowledge of classical authors, critical judgment in matters literary, and other criteria that look toward a humanist attitude.

¹⁶⁴ "AMOR VINCIT OMNIA ET NOS CEDAMUS AMORI. . . . Hic terminatur questio Galli. Nunc Virgilius, ponens finem huic libro Bucolicorum, loquitur. Et inuocat Musas et excusat se si non procedet plus, quia breuis oratio penetrat celum quasi dicat feci uolumen paruum, sed ponderosum" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 52va; Assisi 304, fol. 122vb-123ra). Here *questio* is understood as "complaint" or "lament" rather than *quaestio* ("question"); see *quaestio*, entry number 2, *questio* < *queri*, in J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, ed. C. Van de Kieft (Leiden, 1984), 878. Not only does the sense of the passage call for the choice of "complaint," but the fact that the Assisi manuscript reads *conquestio* (fol. 122vb) in place of the *questio* of *Recolelio B*, supports this translation.

¹⁶⁵ "Ecce quomodo concludit egregie. ITE DOMUM. Ipse excusauerat se Musis. Nunc liceniat capellas suas, quia scitis quod in sero solent capre reduci domum. O CAPELLE id est egloge mee ITE DOMUM, recedite a studio meo, quia estis SATURE emendate. ITE scilicet in publicum. VENIT HESPERUS id est fit sero, id est feci finem. Et in hoc terminatur totum hoc opus Bucolicorum" (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 52vb; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 41v; Assisi 304, fol. 123ra-b).

APPENDIX 1

A. Manuscripts containing a continuous commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*

1. Cremona, Biblioteca Governativa (Statale), 109.

Paper, 192 fols., 282×213 mm., s. xv^{2/4}, Italy, single column of 40 lines.

Commentary on the *Eclogues*: (Accessus) Inc. (fol. 1r) “‘Hec est Maronis gloria ut nullius laudibus crescat, nullius vituperationibus minuatur.’ Macrobius libro .6. *Saturnalium* (*Saturnalia* 1.24.8). (I)n principio huius libri sunt .6. generaliter videnda. . . .” Expl. “buccolicus id est bos parvus inde buccolica. Egle grece latine capra inde egloga.”¹⁶⁶ (Commentary) Inc. (fol. 1r) “⟨T⟩itire tu patule etc. Egloga ista prima dividi potest in tot partes generales quot sunt dialogi id est collocutiones duorum scilicet pastorum. . . .” Expl. (fol. 41v) “Hesperus venit id est fit sero. Et in hoc breviter terminatur totum istud opus Buccolicorum. Ad laudem Dei omnipotentis Amen. Explicant glose Buccolicorum Virgilii per Benevenutum.”

Commentary on the *Georgics*: Inc. (fol. 42r) “Quid faciat letas. ‘Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.’ Virgilius secundo Georgicorum (*Geor.* 2.490). . . .” Expl. (fol. 114r) “cecini te Titire te patule recubans sub tegmine fagi Ad laudem Dei omnipotentis Amen. Explicit Benevenutus super Bucol. et Georg. Virgilii.”

Bibl.: Giuseppe Mazzatinti and Albano Sorbelli, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia*, vol. 70 (Florence, 1939), 83.

2. London, British Library Additional 10095.

Paper, 222 fols., 295×219 mm., s. xv¹, Italy, written by several hands, 2 columns of 32–48 lines.

Add. 10095 contains seven texts, the first of which is Benvenuto's commentary on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. The commentary on the *Eclogues* is acephalous and begins on fol. 3r at the glosses on *Eclogue* 1.12: “certe male dicit quia si dicit turbatur ista est proposicio infinita et sic potest intelligi de omnibus agris mundi. . . .” Expl. (fol. 42r) “Hesperus uenit id est fit sero. Et in hoc breviter terminatur totum istud opus buccolicorum ad laudem Dei omnipotentis. Amen.”

Commentary on the *Georgics*: Inc. (fol. 42r) “Quid faciat letas etc. ‘Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,’ Virgilius secundo Georgicorum. . . .” Expl. (fol. 106r) “cecini te titire te patule recubans sub tegmine fagi. Ad laudem Dei omnipotentis. Amen. Explicant feliciter recollecte buccolicorum et georgicorum sub Reverendissimo Magistro Benevenuto de Ymola.”

Bibl.: *List of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years MDCCCXXXVI–MDCCCXL* (London, 1843), 11; A. G. Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c.700–1600 in the Department of Manuscripts, British Library*, vol. 1 (London, 1979), 27, no. 21; R. D. Williams and T. S. Pattie, *Virgil:*

¹⁶⁶ For the full text of the *accessus*, see Appendix 2, item 1.

His Poetry through the Ages (London, 1982), Appendix 2, 139, no. 3; Kristeller, *Iter italicum* 4:87b.

3. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1262.
Paper, 133 fols., 296×206 mm., s. xv (1428), Italy, 2 columns of 51–54 lines.

Commentary on the *Eclogues*: *Inc.* (fol. 1r) “*Titire tu patule recubans* etc. Egloga ista potest dividi in tot partes quot sunt dialogi id est colloquitiones pastorales per se. . . . *Expl.* (fol. 52v) “*Venit hesperus id est fit sero id est feci finem. Et in hoc terminatur totum hoc opus Bucolicorum.*”

Commentary on the *Georgics*: *Inc.* (fol. 53r) “*Quid faciat letas* etc. ‘Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.’ Virgilius tertio [sic] Georgicorum. . . .” *Expl.* (fol. 133v) “*cecini te Titire O Tytire recubans sub tegmine fagi.* Explicant recollecte Bucolicorum et Georgicorum sub Reverendo Magistro Benevenuto de Imola scripte et complete 1428 die xxiiia Junii.”

Bibl.: Elisabeth Pellegrin et al., *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1975), 508; Kristeller, *Iter italicum* 2:417a.

4. Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. class. c.9.
Paper, 213 fols., 285×205 mm., s. xv¹, Italy, 2 columns of 39 lines.

Commentary on the *Eclogues*: *Inc.* (fol. 4r) “*Tityre tu patule.* (E)Gloga ista potest dividi in tot partes quot sunt dialogi id est colloquitiones pastorales per se. . . .” *Expl.* (fol. 80r–v) “*Venit hesperus id est fit sero id est feci finem et in hoc terminatur totum hoc opus buccolicum.* Explicant recollectiones libri buccolicorum, recollecte sub Reverendo magistro Benevenuto de Imola in civitate Ferarie millesimo iiii lxxviii die xxiiii decembris.” This subscription, with the date 1378, seems to have been copied from the exemplar and does not indicate the date of the manuscript itself.

Commentary on the *Georgics*: *Inc.* (fol. 82r) “*(Q)uid faciat letas* etc. ‘Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.’ Virgilius ait tertio [sic] georgicorum. . . .” *Expl.* (fol. 211r) “*cecini te titire O Titire recumbans sub tegmine fagi.* Explicant recollecte bucolicorum et georgicorum sub reverendo magistro (Cyone de Monte Pulciana in civitate Ferarie).” The entry in parentheses was written over an erased inscription which, with the aid of an ultraviolet lamp, can be read as “*Beneuenuto de Ym(o)l(a) . . . in civitate. . . .*” This reading of the erasure was kindly provided by Dr. Bruce C. Barker-Benfield, Department of Western Manuscripts, Bodleian Library.

Bibl.: *The Bodleian Library Record* 1 (1938–41): 53; Kristeller, *Iter italicum* 4:252a–253b.

5. Assisi, Biblioteca e Centro di Documentazione Francescana (Sacro Convento), fondo antico 304.
Paper, 193 fols., 315×212 mm., s. xv¹, Italy, 2 columns of 54–60 lines.

Commentary on the *Eclogues* (following an anonymous commentary on Cicero's *Rhetorica ad Herennium* on fols. 1–80): *Inc.* (fol. 84r) “*(T)itire tu patule etc.* Ista

egloga potest dividi in tot partes quot sunt dialogi id est colocutiones pastorales. . . ." *Expl.* (fol. 123r) "Veni hesperus. fit sero id est fecii [sic] finem. Et in hoc terminatur totum hoc opus bucolicum. Deo gratias. Recolet [sic] libri bucolicorum Virgilii secundum Magistrum Benevenutum."

Commentary on the *Georgics*: *Inc.* (fol. 124r) "(Q)uid faciat letas segetes et cetera. 'Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.' Virgilius tertio [sic] Georgicorum. . . ." *Expl.* (fol. 193v) "audax iuventa scilicet audax iuventute scilicet *Titire tu patule recubans sub tegmine fagi*. Amen. Expleta [sic] sunt recolectiones libri Georgicorum. Amen."

Bibl.: G. Mazzatinti, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia*, vol. 4 (Forlì, 1894), 69; C. Cenci, *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad Sacram Conventum Assisiensem*, vol. 2 (Assisi, 1981), 544–45, no. 1939; Kristeller, *Iter italicum* 1:5a–b.

6. Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität F V 49.¹⁶⁷

Paper, 109 fols., 300×215 mm., s. XV med., Italy, 2 columns of 47–51 lines. The manuscript contains glosses in several Italian hands.

Commentary on the *Eclogues*: *Inc.* (fol. 1r) "Titire tu patule etc. Ista egloga potest dividi in tot partes quot sunt dialogi. . . ." *Expl.* (fol. 42r) "venit hesperus id est fit sero id est feci finem et in hoc terminatur opus totum hoc bucolicum etc."

Commentary on the *Georgics*: *Inc.* (fol. 43r) "(Q)uid faciat letas segetes quo sidere terram 'Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.' Virgilius 3° georgicorum [sic]. . . ." *Expl.* fol. 107rb: "et cecini scilicet ego audax iuventa scilicet audax in iuventute cecini *Titire tu patule recubans sub tegmine fagi*. Explicant recolectiones bucol. et georgicorum secundum magistrum Benevenutum de Ymola etc. Laus sit Christo."

7. Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Campori Append. 263 (gamma H.5.11).

Paper, 196 fols., Italy, s. XV^{1/4}, single column of 30 lines.

Commentary on the *Georgics* (after an anonymous *Eclogues* commentary on fols. 3r–57v): *Inc.* (fol. 59r) "P. Virgilii Maronis Georgicorum Comentum: *Quid faciat letas segetes etc.* 'Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.' Virgilius secundo Georgicorum. Ut igitur huius felicitatis principium aliquale promereri valeamus breviter perstringende huius operis cause que in Bucolicis diffusius sunt distincte. . . ." *Expl.* (fol. 196v) "ignobilis id est *non* nobilis, quia ut videtis materia est bassa, *quia* ego *lusi carmina pastorum*, et in hoc tangit librum Bucholicorum; 'que' pro 'et' ego *audax iuventa* id est *audax* in *iuventute cecini te Titire o Titire recubans sub tegmine fagi*."

Bibl.: Raimondo Vandini, *Appendice Prima al Catalogo dei Codici e Manoscritti Posseduti dal Marchese Giuseppe Campori* (Modena, 1886), 100; Kristeller, *Iter italicum* 1:388a.

¹⁶⁷ The Basel manuscript formerly had the shelfmark O III 4. I owe a description and a microfilm of the manuscript to the kindness of Dr. Martin Steinmann, who located the manuscript and assigned the current shelfmark to it; see n. 17 above.

8. Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, Rossi 228 (36 D 25).
Paper, 59 fols., s. xv, Italy, single column of 26 lines.

This manuscript contains a short commentary on the *Eclogues*, fols. 26v–33v, brief portions of which are similar in wording to the commentary by Benvenuto but do not follow any known *recollectio* exactly. The commentary on several *Eclogues*, most notably on 1, 4, 8, and 10, begins with phrases like those of Benvenuto, but after a few lines the wording takes on the resemblance of a *divisio*, unlike the text of Benvenuto: *Eclogue 1* (fol. 26v) “*Titire. In ista Egloga Virgilius intelligit quadruplicem sensum scilicet Fabularem, Istoriale, Allegoricum, Tropologicum. Fabularis sensus est iste. Pastor quidam nomine Melibeus alium pastorem inspiciens nomine Titirum sub umbra frondose arboris feliciter quiescentem, qui quandam amicam suam valde formosam docebat dulciter decantare; ipsum alloquitur eius felicitatem admirans, infelicitatem propriam pariter deplorando . . .*”; *Eclogue 4* (fol. 29r) “*Scicilides muse. Egloga prima continet querimoniam Melibei depulsi a patria et agris suis privati. Secunda continet querimoniam Coridonis id est Virgilii non admissi tam cito ad gratiam Augusti. Tertia continet querimoniam contentionem duorum pastorum scilicet Virgilii et alterius sibi invicem objicientium furtu. Nunc in hac quarta paccatis iurgis emulorum tamquam poeta probatus et approbatus describere satagit magnam et eximiam felicitatem sub quo claruit dixit et floruit in scribendo. Item Virgilius descrip- turus rem altam petit licentiam, quia excessurus est bucolici carminis formam. Et primo apostrophat ad musas quas hucusque fuerat imitatus . . .*”; *Eclogue 8* (fol. 31v) “*Pastorum musam. In precedenti ponitur victoria quam habuit Virgilius contra emulos suos coram Augusto Cesare. In hac vero egloga consequenter ponit effectum ipsius victorie qui talis est. Nam introducit Damonem qui interpretatur obliquus per quem possim intelligere eius emulos, quia emuli solent oblique respicere . . .*”; *Eclogue 10* (fol. 33r) “*Extremum hunc Arethusa. Postquam in precedenti proxime egloga Virgilius per introductos pastores agrorum suorum occupationem contra decretum Cesaris sibi factam deploravit et scripsit. Nunc in ista ultima deplorat infelicitatem Galli poete eximii et amici sui qui fuit prefectus Egipti per Augustum constitutus sed quamquam fuisse amicus Augusti. . . . Expl. (fol. 33v): “ponit qualiter autor ipse dicit finem bucolicis versibus se facturum.”* On folios 33v–37v there are *divisiones* of the *Georgics* as far as the beginning of book 3, with wording unlike that of Benvenuto. Fols. 38–54 contain *divisiones* of the *Aeneid*.

Bibl.: Armando Petrucci, *Catalogo Sommario dei Manoscritti del Fondo Rossi*, Sezione Corsiniana, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (Rome, 1977), 110–11; Kris-teller, *Iter italicum* 2:115a.

9. Florence, Museo Horne, 2924 (D. 3. 35).
Paper, 190 fols., s. xv (1484), Italy, single column of 33 lines.

Commentary on the *Georgics*: *Inc.* (fol. 1r): “*Quid fac*i*at letas etc. ‘Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.’ Virgilius tertio [sic] Georgicorum. Vt igitur huius felicitatis principium aliquale promere valeamus sunt perstringende huius libri cause in Buc . . . diff*u*ssius pertractate . . .*” (upper left corner of fol. 1 has been torn off).

Expl. (fol. 188r) “*ignobilis: sed ut vides materia est bassa. qui ego lusi carmina pastorum: Et in hoc tangit librum Buccolicorum: ‘que’ pro ‘et’ ego audax iuventa id est in iuventute cecini te Titire recumbans sub tegmine fagi patule.* Finis die Mercurii Pridie Nonas Sextiles: M° cccc° lxxxiii° hora tertiarum. Brendulis. Quo tempore facta fuit pax: Inter omnes reges Italicos adversantes illustrissimo d. d. Venetiarum et ipsum Dominium: pro bello Civitatis Ferrarie Laus Deo Patri et Filio et Spiritu Sancto. 1484.”

Bibl.: Inventario dei Manoscritti e Libri della Fondazione Horne; Kristeller, Iter italicum 5:616a-b.

B. Manuscripts containing marginal glosses by Benvenuto da Imola

1. Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 960 (C. II. 7).

Parchment, 206 fols., 262×182 mm., s. XIV (1393–94), Italy, written in a single column and 35 lines of Virgil’s text per folio.

Text of the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*, with marginal and interlinear glosses: *Eclogues*, fols. 11r–23r (*Expl.* “*Deo Gratias agamus. Amen. Bucolicorum Virgilii liber explicit 1393, 10 Septembris*”); *Georgics*, fols. 24r–55v (*Expl.* “*Georgicorum Virgilii liber quartus explicit quem ego Astolfinus de Marinonibus anno 1393 die 21 Novembris altissimo suffragante perfeci. Deo Gratias Amen*”); *Aeneid*, fols 58v–203v (*Expl.* “*Eximii poetarum Publili Maronis Virgilii Liber duo decimus Eneydos Deo dante explicit scriptus Papie per me [in a different hand: Astolfinum de Marinonibus] anno 1394, et 20 Augusti luce finitus.*”)

Remigio Sabbadini states that in the years 1393–94 Astolfinus de Marinonibus copied into Casanatense 960 the text of the three works of Virgil from Petrarch’s Ambrosian manuscript of Virgil (Ambrosianus S.P. 10/27, *olim A 49 inf.*, at that time in the Viscontea di Pavia (Sabbadini, *Le scoperte* 2:123). Besides ample Petrarchan and Servian notes there are unidentified glosses in a number of hands throughout.

Casanatense 960 is the oldest manuscript identified thus far showing glosses by Benvenuto da Imola. As observed by Vladimiro Zabughin, there are several marginal notes by Benvenuto on the *Eclogues* (there are also Benvenutan glosses on the *Georgics*, which Zabughin did not realize were glossed by Benvenuto) labeled “B” or “secundum B” (Zabughin, “*L’Umanesimo nella Storia della Scienza, II,*” 100 and n. 6.) Benvenutan glosses, however, are not limited to those so marked, but there are many more that are not labeled.

An example of the glossator’s method of using material from Benvenuto can be found at fol. 12r, top right margin, *Eclogue* 1.65–66. The glossator begins by condensing a lengthy note by Benvenuto, as found in *Recollectio B*, represented by Ottob. lat. 1262, fols. 5vb–6ra. At *Eclogue* 1.65–66 Casanatense 960 reads “*Et rapidum Crete. ve(niemus) Oaxen. Hic Benevenutus impugnat Servium, dicens opinionem esse falsam, quia Oaxes est fluvius Crete insule valde velox. . . . Et penitus toto divisos orbe. . . . Sed quare (Servius) dicit divisos? certe quia Anglia est divisa a toto circuitu terre, quia est iuxta oceanum inter occidentem et septentrionem, quia ut volunt astrologi, ipsa non tegitur sub aliquo climate seu circulo solis.*”

The last Benvenutan gloss on the *Eclogues*, 10.75–77, is written across the top of fol. 23r. It is, like the gloss on 1.65–66, close in wording to *Recollectio B* (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 52va–b) and *C* (Assisi 304, fol. 123r): “*Surgamus. Dixit supra se velle facere finem generalem. Nunc ostendit se velle imponere finem specialem. . . . Sature id est correcte emendate. Ite scilicet in publicum. Venit hesperus id est fit sero id est feci finem et in hoc terminatur totum opus bucolicum.*”

The first gloss by Benvenuto on the *Georgics* occurs at fol. 24r, *Geor.* 1.11 (cf. *Recollectio B*, Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 54r): “*Invocat faunos et repetit faunos et non sine quare ut cum eis simul invocet dryades.*” Benvenutan glosses end on the *Georgics* at 4.564, fol. 55v: “*Parthonope id est Neapolis. ‘Parthene’ grece latine virgo. Ista civitas Neapolitana fuit olim edificata a Grecis et multi credunt quod edificata fuerit ab Enea. Vnde Petrarcha Neapolis greca civitas. Invenerunt in monte sub terra iuvenem virginem. Ideo inde nominauerunt eam.*” This gloss follows *Recollectio C* (represented by Assisi 304), fol. 193vb. Many of the scholia on the *Aeneid* are Servian. Some of the glosses are from the commentary of Ciones (Zonus) de Magnalis, including several chapter descriptions. There is no evidence of glosses on the *Aeneid* by Benvenuto.

Bibl.: Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini et greci ne' secoli XIV e XV* (see n. 14 above), 2:123; Zabughin (see n. 13 above), “*L’Umanesimo nella Storia della Scienza, II,*” 87, 99–102 with notes, and *Vergilio nel Rinascimento* 1:44–47 and nn. 210–23; *A Microfilm Corpus of Unpublished Inventories of Latin Manuscripts*, compiled by F. Edward Crazz, 190, p. 71; Lord, “*Commentary on Virgil’s Eclogues by Benvenuto da Imola*” (see n. 12 above), 378–79; Kristeller, *Iter italicum* 2:95a.

2. Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, 187 (A. III. 20).

Parchment, 173 fols., 290×200 mm., s. XIV ex. (a. 1396), Italy, text of Virgil’s *Opera*, with 33–40 lines of text per folio.

Eclogues, fols. 2r–13r; *Georgics*, fols. 13v–42r; *Aeneid*, fols. 44r–172r (*Expl.* “*Explicit feliciter Eneis 1396. 12 Iulii. Ind. X. per me Stamonium de Regno. Deo gratias. Amen.*”). Although the name of Stamonius occurs in this explicit as having written the manuscript, the marginalia are derivative from a variety of sources; for the *Eclogues* he took his glosses from Benvenuto da Imola without acknowledgement.

The glosses are in a minute, contemporary hand, beginning at fol. 2 with the following gloss from Benvenuto in the left margin at *Eclogue* 1.11: “*Secundus dialogus et nascitur ex primo quia Melibeus commendaverat felicitatem Titiri et per hec Titirus potuisset suspicari quod sibi Melibeus invideret. Ideo cautus Melibeus preoccurrit removendo suspicionem Titiro, dicens: ‘bone frater non ex invidia immo solum ex quadam admiratione dixi predicta, cum simus pastores de eadem patria.’*” This gloss is continued, also at *Eclogue* 1.11, in the outer right margin: “*non equidem. Adverte quod auctor loquitur hic propriissime, quia si volumus loqui historice, accidit tota die quod aliquis commendat felicitatem sui amici. Et post commendationem dicit: ‘certe non inuideo.’ Si volumus loqui tropologice, idem accidit, quia dicit vir civilis quando commendat hominem solitarium in veritate ‘non inuideo sibi.’ Si volumus etiam loqui allegorice, dicit aliis poeta: ‘licet Virgilius sit excelsus apud Octavianum,*

non tamen pungor aculeo invidiae. Ipse enim non est sui iuris.' " Excerpts from the same gloss continue in a note between the Virgilian text and the outer right margin: "Causa admirationis, quasi dicat ratio admirationis est quia sumus pulsi de nostra patria et campos amisimus. Tu vero recuperasti tuos, vel quasi dicat magne quercui adhesisti. Nos vero non."

These notes bear close resemblance to *Recollectio A*. Additional marginal glosses occur regularly from Benvenuto as far as *Eclogue* 4.33, where the last gloss on the *Eclogues* is written at the top of fol. 6r: "Nam tempore Augusti fuit ita acerba fames in Roma quod Romani populares iecerunt micas panis in faciem Augusti, exprobrantes sibi quod non provideret eis de annona et tunc Augustus fuit dispositus removere omnem provisionem a communi ut omnibus daretur causa arandi et colendi terras."

The glossator, in commenting on *Eclogue* 4, went from lemma to lemma in Benvenuto's commentary, selecting from the Imolese's double method of interpreting the *Eclogue* according to its application either to Augustus or to Christ, and consistently chose Augustan glosses to reproduce. There are only very rare and scattered glosses on the *Georgics*. The marginalia, of course, non-Benvenutan, resume with the *Aeneid* and are of mixed origin, with some from unidentified sources, from Servius, and some from Ciones (Zonus) de Magnalis. There are also scholia in a sixteenth-century hand.

Bibl.: Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, *Indici e Cataloghi*, n.s., II, *Catalogo dei Manoscritti della Biblioteca Casanatense*, La Libreria dello Stato, I (1949), 95–96; Zabughin, *Vergilio nel Rinascimento* 1:54 and nn. 281–87, and "L'Umanesimo nella Storia della Scienza, II," 87 and n. 2; Lord, "Commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*," 379, 398–400.

3. Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale IV E 9.

Parchment and paper, 84 fols., 305×231 mm., s. xv, Italy.

Text of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, with marginal and interlinear glosses, fols. 2r–58r: *Eclogues*, fols. 3r–17v; *Georgics*, fols. 20–58. At fol. 58r there is the subscription "Gratias Dei Franciscellus Mancinus." Virgil's text is surrounded by very dense and crowded marginal notes that cover its pages in close groupings. Very many of the glosses are from Servius, often labeled. There are abundant glosses from Benvenuto's commentary on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, some of them labeled "Benevenutus dicit," "Magister Benevenutus," or "secundum Benevenutum de Imola," but a great many more, often of considerable length, are without label. They belong to *Recollectio A*. Among other sources for notes are Nonius Marcellus, Donatus, the Virgilian commentary attributed to Anselm of Laon, Nicholas Tretet, Petrarch's Ambrosian manuscript of Virgil, and Franciscus Philelphus.

The citations from Benvenuto begin in the right margin of fol. 2v. The longest quotation gives the full introductory passage to *Eclogue* 1, requiring 49 tightly written marginal lines, situated amid glosses from other sources: "Magister Benevenutus: Nota quod in ista prima egloga Virgilius intendit quadruplicem sensum, scilicet fabularem, historiale, allegoricum, et tropologicum. Fabularis sensus est quod quidam pastor dictus Melibeus admirans felicitatem Titiri quiescentis sub umbra arboris fron-

dose et lete canentis de amore cuiusdam sue amice alloquitur eum, deplorans suam infelicitatem. . . ." The passage continues up to the point where the literal interpretation of *Eclogue* 1.1 begins: "Vnde per istum Titirum ita quies(centem) intellige omnem virum solitarium et contemplativum qui bene vacat otio et introducitur meditativus et cet. Item introducitur canens et letus quia 'felicitas maxime consistit in speculatione' sicut probat Philosophus et cet. Per oppositum Melibeus est omnis vir civilis activus qui implicatur maximis laboribus et cet. Ad literam descendendo. O *Titire.*" This passage is almost verbatim the same as the text of Cremona 109, fol. 1r-v. The last citation from Benvenuto in the *Eclogues* occurs at *Eclogue* 10.72, fol. 17v: "Pierides. vult dicere Virgilius licet ego descripserim hec in stilo plano et humili tamen ipse Gallus sribet in stilo alto et heroico. . . . Modo replicat: 'facietis hec maxima Gallo cuius amor tantum crescit mihi in horas quantum alnus viridis subicit se novo veri.' "

The first gloss from Benvenuto on the *Georgics* begins at *Geor.* 1.5, fol. 20: "Liber et alma Ceres. invocat illa numina deorum et dearum que presunt agris et agricolis. Et invocat duo principaliora lumina scilicet solem et lunam. . . . Ergo bene sol et luna quos invocat sunt principaliora numina." The last gloss by Benvenuto on the *Georgics* is at *Geor.* 4.559, fol. 58: "Hec super tertia et ultima pars in qua Virgilius imponit finem toti operi Georgicorum. Et in ista clausula finali vult dicere plura. . . . Et ille vicit *dat iura* id est leges *per populos volentes* videlicet obedientes et *affectat* id est desiderat *viam Olympo* id est ad celum." The text of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* follows the text of Virgil.

Bibl.: Cataldo Jannelli, *Catalogus Bibliothecae Latinae veteris et classicae manuscriptae quae in Regio Neapolitano Museo Borbonico adseruntur* (Naples, 1827), 152–153, no. CCIX; Virgilio, *Mostra di Manoscritti e libri a stampa, Catalogo* (Naples, 1981), 22; Louis Holtz, "La main de Franciscellus Mancinus et le fonds ancien de San Severino e Sossio de Naples," *Scriptorium* 44 (1990): 217–58 at 237–48 (for Franciscellus Mancinus, although this manuscript is not listed among those copied by Mancinus and was believed to have been lost; see p. 245: "Parallèlement pour les auteurs profanes nous n'avons plus ni le Virgile . . . de Franciscellus Mancinus"); Lord, "Virgil's *Eclogues*, Nicholas Trevet, and the Harmony of the Spheres" (see n. 36 above), 255–59, and "Commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*," 380; Kristeller, *Iter italicum* 1:411a.

APPENDIX 2

1. Accessus to the Commentary on the *Eclogues* by Benvenuto da Imola

Cremona 109, fol. 1r:

"Hec est Maronis gloria ut nullius laudibus crescat, nullius uituperationibus minuatur." Macrobius libro .6. *Saturnalium* (Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.24.8).

(I)N principio huius libri sunt .6. generaliter uidenda. Primo quis fuerit libri autor. Secundo que est ipsius materia. Tertio que fuit autoris intentio. Quarto que utilitas. Quinto cui parti philosophie supponatur. Sexto et ultimo quis sit libri

titulus. Primo autor libri fuit Publius Virgilius Maro Parthenias poeta Mantuanus. Publius dicitur quia publice doctrinam suam tradidit. Virgilius dictus fuit a uirga quia mater eius pregnans de eo somniauit se peperisse quandam uirgam lauream que cum tangebat terram crescebat usque ad celum. Et hoc fuit uerum quia ipse peritissimus descriptsit rerum multarum naturas que sub celo sunt et generaliter de omnibus uirtutibus et uiciis. Virga competit etiam multis scilicet pastoribus et ipse in libro isto Buccolicorum descriptsit pastores. Virga competit bubulcis et ipse tractat in libro Georgicorum de bubulcis. Virga etiam competit regibus et ducibus armatis et ipse in libro Eneidos tractat de bellis et ducibus armatis. Maro est agnomen autoris. Et dicitur a “maron” quod est nigrum quia Virgilius fuit niger et in uultu rusticus sed moribus excellentissimus. Parthenias dicitur a parthene grece latine virgo quia fuit honestus ad modum virginis. Poeta est nomen professionis et nomen sacrum. Mantuanus dicitur a patria quia fuit de Mantua ciuitate. Secundo quid sit materia libri? Materia libri Buccolicorum est collocutio pastorum; libri Georgicorum est agriculturae cultus; libri Eneidos armorum exercitium. Tertio intentio autoris fuit duplex, privata et publica. Publica quia intendit describere uitam uiciosam potentum ducum et dominorum. Privata quia intendit promereri gratiam Cesaris Augusti, describens tria necessaria esse regi et duci scilicet opulentiam, prudentiam et exercitium armorum. Quarto que utilitas. Utilitas in libro Buccolicorum est quadruplex. Prima ut licenter et impune detegat uicia potentum et magnatum. Secunda ut honeste et sine rubescencia possit laudare se et alios sub stilo bucolico. Tertia fuit ne res ipsa siue materia uilesceret. Quarta est delectatio quia delectatur assimilatione rei ad rem. Utilitas in libro Georgicorum est cognitio frugum terrarum pascuorum et pecudum. Utilitas in libro Eneidos est cognitio armorum et uirorum potentum in armis. Quinto cui parti philosophie supponatur. Supponitur ethice quia de moribus tractat. Sexto et ultimo quis sit libri titulus. Titulus libri est Publi Virgilii Maronis Partheniatis poete Mantuani liber Buccolicorum incipit. Buccolicus id est bos parvus inde Buccolica. Egle grece latine capra inde egloga.

2. Augustus Compared to a Mighty Oak (*Eclogue 1.1*)

Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 1rb:

SUB TEGMINE FAGI id est sub umbra quercus loquendo pastoraliter, sed loquendo moraliter SUB TEGMINE FAGI id est sub umbra Augusti seu Octauiani id est sub protectione Augusti. Nota quod hic est metaphora congruentissima. Quercus magna est arbor et alta faciens umbram magnam et ramos magnos undique diffundens. Ita erat Augustus, quia diffundebat ramos suos id est brachia sua et uim suam per totum orbem ab Oriente ad Occidentem. Et facit magnam umbram scilicet felicitatis et glorie sue, quia totum orbem felicitauit et in pace diu retinuit et per quinquaginta *⟨sex⟩¹⁶⁸* annos possedit Imperium orbis terrarum.

¹⁶⁸ Supplied from Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. class. c. 9, fol. 4va.

3. A Scenario Invented by Benvenuto (*Eclogue 2*)

Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 7rb–va:

Ista secunda egloga continet querimoniam Tytyri super duriciem Augusti qui cito non admittebat eum ad gratiam et bonorum restitutionem suorum. Et ista est materia istius secunde eglogae¹⁶⁹ propter unum errorem Servii extirpandum. Dicit Servius: “Tu dicis quod Tytyrus conqueritur de admissione tarda ad gratiam Augusti.” Et iam admissio est facta ut ostendit in prima egloga precedenti. Certe clare ostendo quod hic est ordo et continuatio propria. Et do exemplum clare. Qui-dam ueniet de partibus meis. Et dicet michi moranti extra patriam meam: “Quo-modo stas tu?” Dicam: “Ego bene sto, quia dominus meus dedit michi tale beneficium.” Dicet ipse: “Bene stas, sed certe nos alii ualde grauamur et sumus in guerris.” Et sic de similibus. Et etiam audiuisti in egloga preterita quod Tytyrus inuitauerat Melibeum ad cenam¹⁷⁰ et facta collocutione secum, ego dicam: “Vide bene est uerum quod sto bene, sed antequam uenerim ad istam gratiam multum laborau. Et ita iste Tytyrus audiuerauit Melibeum admirari de restitutione bonorum suorum tanquam amicum conterraneum. Sic dicit Tytyrus. Et incipit loqui cum Melibeo. Dices tu: “Et quomodo stetit Virgilius diu Rome antequam admit-teretur ad gratiam? Certe, quia modo ipse ibat ad istum principem, modo ad illum, quia modo ibat ad Pollionem, modo ibat ad Agrippam.” Et ideo [fol. 7va] facit hic querimoniam de difficultate. Et sic ista materia bene consequitur ad primam.

4. Allegorization and Identification (*Eclogue 2.2–7*)

Cremona 109, fol. 6r–v (cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fols. 7vb–8ra; Assisi 304, fols. 88vb–89ra):

Et subdit appositiae ALEXIM DELICIAS DOMINI id est Iulii Gaii Cesaris, et bene dicit DELICIAS quia Iulius Cesar summe dilexit Augustum quia fuit eius nepos et dereliquit eum heredem suum. NEC HABEBAT QUID SPERARET id est licet ipse Coridon amaret Augustum tamen ille non reddebat sibi uicem. Nec miremini, quia non est de more dominorum admittere unum tam cito in amiciciam et gratiam. Secundo quia Virgilius erat iuuenis ignotus et peregrinus, tertio quia Virgilius erat rusticus facie et ualde uerecundus et tacitus.¹⁷¹ Et ideo propter ista non poterat tam cito uenire ad gratiam Augusti. Preterea habebat ipse multos emulos. TANTUM INTER. Dicit quod ipse Coridon ibat inter spissas arbores et ibi solus conquere-batur. Et hoc est dicere quod ueniebat INTER DENSAS FAGOS id est inter principes apud ipsum Augustum scilicet ibat ad Mecenatem ad Agrippam ad Pollionem ad Gallum. TANTUM pro “solummodo” ille Coridon VENIEBAT ASSIDUE INTER FAGOS DENSAS. VMBROSA CACUMINA appositiae. Et ille Coridon IBI scilicet Rome SOLUS

¹⁶⁹ Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. class c. 9 adds “et aduerte quod hic opportet multa dici in principio istius secunde eglogae.”

¹⁷⁰ The Oxford manuscript adds “et ita ego inuitabo istum meum compatriotam ad cenam.”

¹⁷¹ The clauses are given in the order found in British Library Add. 10095, fol. 8ra.

IACTABAT id est effundebat HEC INCONDITA id est ista carmina non ornata et incomposita. Vel hystorice ex indignatione et ira conquerebatur MONTIBUS ET SILVIS id est Rome in qua sunt .vii. montes. STUDIO INANI id est uano quia frustra. O CRUDELIS. Nunc incipit querimonia Virgilii. O CRUDELIS ALEXI id est O inhumane Augste. NICHIL CURAS MEA CARMINA hoc est tu es magnus poeta et quomodo non delectaris in meis carminibus? Et NIL MISERERE pro “-ris” NOSTRI id est non habes tu aliquam misericordiam de me spoliato? Et DENIQUE id est finaliter COGIS ME MORI id est ducis me ad desperationem.

5. Citations from Augustine and Jerome at *Eclogue 4.3*

Cremona 109, fol. 15r (cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 19rb; Assisi 304, fol. 97ra):

Augustinus in suo *De ciuitate Dei* sentit et intendit quod Virgilius loquatur de Christo. Beatus Ieronimus qui fuit tempore sancti Augustini truffatur de hoc et dixit quod Virgilius dixit de Augusto et non de Christo.

Augustine, *De ciuitate Dei* 10.27 (ed. B. Dombart, A. Kalb, CCL 47 [Turnhout, 1955], 302):

Non enim te decepisset, quem uestra, ut tu ipse scribis, oracula sanctum immortalemque confessa sunt; de quo (Christo) etiam poeta nobilissimus poetice quidem, quia in alterius adumbrata persona, ueraciter tamen si ad ipsum (Christum) referas, dixit:

Te duce, si qua manent sceleris uestigia nostri,
Inrita perpetua soluent formidine terras (*Ecl. 4.13–14*).

... Nam utique non hoc a se ipso se dixisse Vergilius in eclogae ipsius quarto ferme uersu indicat, ubi ait:

Vltima Cumaei uenit iam carminis aetas (*Ecl. 4.4*);
unde hoc a Cumaea Sibylla dictum esse incunctanter appetit.

Augustine, *Ep.* 137.12 (ed. A. Goldbacher, CSEL 44 [Vienna, 1904], 114):

Nunc ergo, quod Maro ait et omnes uidemus, amomum Assyrium uulgo nascitur. Quod autem ad adiutorium gratiae pertinet, quae in Christo est, ipse est omnino,
quo duce, si qua manent sceleris uestigia nostri,
inrita perpetua soluent formidine terras (*Ecl. 4.13–14*).

Jerome, *Ep.* 53.7 (PL 22:544–45):

... ac non sic etiam Maronem sine Christo possimus dicere Christianum, qui scripserit:

Iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,
Iam noua progenies caelo demittitur alto (*Ecl. 4.6–7*).

... Puerilia sunt haec, et circulatorum ludo similia, docere quod ignores: imo, ut cum stomacho loquar, ne hoc quidem scire quod nescias.

Jerome, *Praefatio in Pentateuchum* (PL 28:182–83):

Aut aliter de eisdem libris per Septuaginta Interpretes, aliter per apostolos Spiritus sanctus testimonia texuit, ut quod illi tacuerunt, hi scriptum esse mentiti sint. Quid igitur? Damnamus veteres? minime: sed post priorum studia in domo Domini quod possumus, laboramus. Illi interpretati sunt ante adventum Christi, et quod nesciebant, dubiis protulere sententiis. Nos post passionem et resurrectionem ejus, non tam prophetiam quam historiam scribimus. Aliter enim audita, aliter visa narrantur. Quod melius intelligimus, melius et proferimus. Audi igitur, aemule; obtrectator, ausculta: non damno, non reprehendo Septuaginta, sed confidenter cunctis illis apostolos praefero.

6. Augustus or Christ? (*Eclogue 4.3*)

Recollectio A

Cremona 109, fol. 15r:

SILVE SUNT DIGNE CONSULE id est urbes sunt digne consule Augusto qui consuluit uniuersa rei p(ublice) prudenter et salubriter. Vel aliter CONSULE id est urbes sunt digne Christo qui consuluit uniuersa saluti et toti humano generi. Vnde scias quod magna questio fuit inter sapientissimos in ista egloga. Augustinus in suo *De ciuitate Dei* (10.27) sentit et intendit quod Virgilius loquatur de Christo. Beatus Ieronimus (*Ep. 53.7*) qui fuit tempore sancti Augustini truf- fatur de hoc et dixit quod Virgilius dixit de Augusto et non de Christo. Sed certe ego credo quod fuerit locutus de Augusto. Attamen ne uidear temerarius dico quod potest credi de Christo et de Augusto.

Recollectio B

Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 19rb:

VRBES SINT DIGNE CONSULE scilicet Augusto quem uocant consulem quia consuluit uniuersa rei p(ublice). . . . Vel CONSULE scilicet Christo qui consuluit ciuitatibus id est toto [sic] generi humano scilicet incarnando. Ita quod potes intelligere tripliciter. Et nota quod magna controuersia fuit de ista egloga iam mille annis elapsis. Augustinus in libro *De ciuitate Dei* (10.27) dicit quod Virgilius loquitur de Christo. Ieronimus (*Ep. 53.7*) truf- fatur et dicit quod loquitur de Augusto. Ideo ne uidear temerarius dico quod potest intelligi de quolibet, sed potius credo quod intellexerit de Christo.

Recollectio C

Assisi 304, fol. 97ra:

SILVE SUNT CONSULE DIGNE. Vrbes sunt digne consule scilicet Augusto quem uocat consulum [sic] quia consuluit uniuersa rei p(ublice). . . . Vel SILVE SUNT DIGNE CONSULE hoc est Christo qui consuluit uniuerso orbi et toto [sic] humano generi. Ita quod potest intelligi dupliciter. Vnde uide fuit magna discordia de ista egloga ideo mille annis elapsis. Augustinus *De ciuitate Dei* (10.27) plenis- sime scribit quod Virgilius loquatur hic de Christo. Beatus Ieronimus (*Ep. 53.7*) de hoc trufatur et dicit quod Virgilius loqui- tur de Augusto et non de Christo. Sed litera potest referri ad Christum et ad Augustum. Nichilominus melius potest referri ad Augustum et quod nichil preuiderit de Christo.

7. “Alter erit tum Tiphys” (*Eclogue* 4.34–36, 31–33)

Ottob. lat. 1262, fols. 21vb–22ra (cf. Cremona 109, fol. 17r–v; Assisi 304, fol. 99ra):

Tum id est tunc etiam *(in)* illa estate ERIT ALTER TYPHIS. Typhis fuit primus patronus nauis scilicet qui duxit Argon primam nauim Hiasonis. Typhis vocatur magister amoris a poetis. Ideo Typhis id est Augustus erit TUM pro tunc id est erit magister amoris et bonus gubernator nauis. Et ita fuit, quia dilexit populos suos, et bene rexit orbem, et rem p_ublicam ET ALTERA ARGO id est nova nauis facta sicut Argon. Et que erit ista? Certe magna et fortis classis armata quam duxit contra Antonium fuit mirabilis, et inaudita apparatu que ARGO VEHAT id est portet HEROAS DELECTOS id est principes electos. Addit ERUNT ETIAM etc. Non intelligas ut aliqui dicunt quod erunt alia bella cum Antonio. Imo dicit quod ultra ista bella ciuilia naualia et terrestria erunt et alia bella extranea, quia gessit bellum Dalmaticum, Hyspanicum Germanicum contra gentes barbaras. Ita quod multa bella facta sunt licet felicia pro eo. ALTERA id est externa BELLA ETIAM ERUNT. ATQUE. Ecce ulterius MAGNUS ACHILLES id est Augustus in armis strenuus ITERUM MITTETUR AD TROIAM. Et est uerum ystorice, quia subiugavit partes orientales et peruenit ad Troiam primam matrem Rome. Et illud est dicere Achilles fuit infestissimus hostis Troianorum missus ad subiugandum et delendum Troiam, et inueniebatur quod sine Achille non poterat subiugari. Et modo Augustus erit missus qui ibit ad Troiam, ne eo modo quo (Achilles) sed ad conseruandum iura Troiana et subiugandum Grecos; hucusque habuisti pro Augusto. Sed pro Christo dic PAUCA VESTIGIA PRESSE [PRISCE] FRAUDIS scilicet demonis infernalis qui fecit peccare primum hominem. Tamen suberunt id est suborientur. Et intellige persecutioes datas contra Ecclesiam. Hoc declarat que uestigia iubeant tentare THETIM RATIBUS quasi dicat quod Christiani et Apostoli erunt coacti discurrere seminando fidem per mundum. Et etiam coacti fugere a facie persequentium. Et CINGERE OPIDA MURIS et similiter coacti reducere se in cauernis ut fecit Silvester persecutus a Constantino antequam esset Christianus. Et QUE IUBEANT INFUNDERE SULCOS id est que cogant ipsos Christianos effici siluestres et laborare. Et TUM id est tunc ALTER TYPHIS id est Christus magister amoris. Bene magister amoris, quia propter amorem in cruce humanum genus redemptionem meruit, et ALTERA ARGO id est nauis Petri, que licet dicatur parua, tamen fuit magna QUE VEHAT id est portet DELECTOS id est de aliis electos HEROAS id est Apostolos. ERUNT ETIAM ALTERA BELLA id est preter istas persecutioes Apostolorum erunt alie persecutioes scilicet hereses, que impugnabunt istam fidem, et MAGNUS ACHILLES id est ipse deus fortissimus exercituum ITERUM MITTETUR AD TROIAM id est ad delendum mundum in die iudicii sicut ACHILLES ad delendum TROIAM.

8. Selected References by Benvenuto to Virgil’s Slender Style in the *Eclogues*

Ecl. 1.2: TENUI AVENA id est cum parua fistula, quia de auena herba fit fistula a pueris. Sed sanius intellige TENUI AVENA id est humili eloquentia, quia utitur stilo depresso et paruo (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 1rb; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 1v).

Ecl. 1.10: CALAMO AGRESTI id est stilo siluestri scilicet bucolico pastorali (Cremona 109, fol. 2r; cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 1vb).

Ecl. 1.28: Ecce quomodo more rustici describit tempus in quo cepit uenire ad libertatem a barbe tonsura (Cremona 109, fol. 3r; cf. Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 3rb).

*Ecl. 1.48: LIMOSO IUNCO id est humili stilo, quia iuncus significat humiditatem et humilitatem ut habuisti in Dante in primo capitulo *Purgatorii* quasi dicat quamuis stilos humilis et planus uideatur tegere ista carmina bucolica* (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 5ra; Dante, *Purgatorio* 1.95, 100–105, 133–36).¹⁷²

Ecl. 5.2: CALAMOS bene loquitur, quia quando scribis sufflas in penna quasi dicat bonus ad faciendum uersus bucolicos, quia illi sunt in stilo leui (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 24ra; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 19r).

Ecl. 6.6–8: NUNC EGO Tytyrus MEDITABOR id est cum meditatione describam MUSAM AGRESTEM id est materiam siluestrem et bucolicam meditatam TENUI ARUNDINE id est humili et basso stilo (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 29va–b; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 24r).

Ecl. 8.11–13: SINE id est desine permitte dignare o Auguste HANC EDERAM id est istam paruam coronam id est descriptionem bucolicam tanquam humilem, quia est materia bassa (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 41va; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 32v).

Eclogue 10.50–51: Et loquitur humiliter, quia dicit facere carmina humilia in stilo tenui. . . . Et in quo stilo? AVENA SICULI PASTORIS id est humili stilo Theocriti id est plane et humiliter (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 51vb–52ra; cf. Cremona 109, fol. 40v).

9. Description of the Epicurean Sect (*Eclogue 6.13–15*)

Recollectio A

Cremona 109, fol. 24r–v

PERGITE PIERIDES. In superiori parte prohemiali istius egloge poeta Virgilius excusauit se Varo quod omissis gestis eius describendis ipse cogebatur prosequi bucolicam. Ideo nunc consequenter in ista parte executiua ipse Virgilius intendit describere bucolice siue pastoraliter sectam Epicureorum, tum quia Varus iuuenis erat et delectabatur tali materia, tum quia ad tempus felicitatis et fertilitatis quale erat tempore Augusti solent homines audire talia libenter et conuertere se ad uoluptates. Ergo dico

Recollectio B

Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 30ra

PERGIT PYERIDES. In superiori parte prohemiali istius egloge sexte poeta Virgilius excusauit se Varo quod omissis gestis eius describendis ipse cogebatur prosequi bucolicam. Ideo nunc consequenter in ista parte executiua ipse Virgilius intendit describere bucolice, siue pastoraliter sectam Epycororum, tum quia Varus iuuenis erat et delectabatur tali materia, tum quia ad tempus felicitatis et fertilitatis quale erat tempus Augusti solet uigere secta Epycororum, et multi conuertuntur ad voluptates. Ergo

¹⁷² See Lacaita, *Comentum* (n. 1 above) 3:49.

quod uult ostendere qualis sit illa secta et qui et quales sint eius effectus et quomodo sit placens et dislicens. Vnde scias quod Virgilius hic configit unam fabulam iocundam sub cuius uelamine ipse aptissime exprimit qualis sit secta Epicureorum. Et fabula est talis. Duo fuerunt pueri qui a casu reperierunt quandam senem in spelunca sua dormientem sepultum somno et uino de cuius capite deciderant serta id est garlande et iuxta eum erat uas plenum uino et isti duo pueri ad solatium collegerunt illa serta et cum illis ceperunt ligare istum senem dormientem et istis sic agentibus tamen timide superuenit una puella speciosa ualde et ista uolens eos iuuare cum moro cepit pingere faciem istius senis illo iam euigilante. Iste ergo senex tandem excitatus ridere cepit et cepit dicere: "quare me ligatis? dimittite me quia ego cantabo ut alias uobis promisi. Sed isti puelle dabo aliud quam cantum"; quasi diceret tacite, "dabo sibi stuprum." Hoc dicto cepit dulciter canere in tantum quod ad eius cantum ceperunt breuiter omnia concurrere et audire que ipse canebat. Hoc premisso ueni ad literam. Ipse Virgilius primo inuocat musas et dicit: O PIERIDES id est O sacre muse PERGITE id est incipite ire simul mecum in istam descriptionem. CROMIS. Statim aggreditur narrationem. Cromis et Nasilus id est duo pueri sic uocati. Isti duo pueri sunt Varus et Virgilius. Et uocat ipsum Varum Cromim qui interpretatur color uarius et in hoc Virgilius illudit uocabulo quia uult dicere Varus Varius. Se uocat Nasilum id est Mantue natus in siluis. Ergo Cromis et Nasilus pueri quia Varus et Virgilius erant iuuenes uel pueri quia poete erant. VIDERE pro "-runt" SILENUM senem. Scilenus fuit nutritor Bachi. Modo ergo dicit quod

ad propositum dico quod scribit sectam Epycurorum. Ostendit que sit illa secta et qui et quales sint eius effectus, et quomodo sit placens apparenter et dislicens existenter. Et ut litera sit clara prius eliciam casum summarium. Virgilius finit hic fabulam unam iocundam sub cuius uelamine ipse aptissime exprimit qualis sit secta Epycurorum. Et fabula est talis. Fuerunt duo pueri, qui a casu reperierunt quandam senem in spelunca sua dormientem sepultum somno et uino de cuius capite deciderant serta seu garlande. Et iuxta eum erat uas plenum uino. Et isti duo pueri collegerunt garlandas prolapsas de capite eius. Et cum illis iocanter ceperunt ligare istum senem dormientem. Et ipsis sic agentibus sed timide superuenit una puella speciose ualde. Et ista uolens eos iuuare et complacere eis cum moro cepit pingere faciem ipsius senis illo eam euigilante. Iste ergo senex tandem excitatus cepit ridere et dicere istis iuuenibus ita ridenter: "quare me ligatis? dimittite me. Non oportet quod ligetis me, quia faciam cantum uobis placitum ut promisi uobis et isti puelle dabo aliud quam cantum," quasi dicat, "dabo ei stuprum." Et relaxatus cepit dulciter canere, in tantum quod ad eius cantum ceperunt omnia concurrere et audire eius cantum. Hec est fabula et materia totius istius literae describende. Hoc premisso uide literam. Virgilius descripturus sectam Epycurorum inuocat scientias, ut faueant sibi in hoc. Ideo dicit: O PYERIDES id est muse PERGITE id est incipite ire simul mecum in istam descriptionem. Ita dicit Titus Liuius. PERGITE IRE id est incipite ire id est fauete michi. Et nunc ingreditur tractatum et exorditur fabellam et dicit CROMIS ET MNASILLUS id est duo pueri sic uocati. Sed ut incedam paulatim, quia

uiderunt Scilenum id est dormientem SOMNO IN ANTRO id est in studio suo quia Epicuri et sui sequaces fuerunt philosophi. Scilenum dico INFLATUM id est impletum VENAS HYACO id est uino quia facit hiare uenas et turgescere. HESTERNO dupliciter potest exponi ab heri id est herino; ita recte dicit Tullius in libro *Phylippicarum* dicit quod Antonius in publico dum arengaret cepit euomere uinum et crapulam ita quod aliquando homo babit tantum quod durat ebrietas per 2 uel 3 dies. Vel dicas uino externo id est peregrino aliunde allato ut semper.

oportet. Isti duo pueri sunt Varus et Virgilius, Varus quem tantum commendauit in parte precedenti. Et uocat ipsum Varum Cromim. Et est nomen pastoris. Et interpretatur color uarius qui non durat, sed de forma in formam transit. Et ipse alludit uocabulo, quia Varus id est Varius, quia uolebat cognoscere uitam et sectam Epycurorum. Virgilius Varo uocat se Mnasillum id est Mantue natum in siluis. Et debet scribi per *m* et *n*, licet *m* non proferatur. PUERI quia erant pastores et iuuenes VIDERE pro “-runt” SYLENUM SENEM. Habes ab Ouidio quod Silenus fuit minister Bacci. Et bene introduxit eum, quia ille qui ministrat Bacco est optimus minister in ista secta Epycurorum. Dicit ergo quod uidit eum IACENTEM id est dormientem SOMNO. Et ubi? IN ANTRO id est studio suo, quia Epycurus fuit magnus philosophus licet haberet illam uariam opinionem. Scilicet quod ponebat summum bonum in felicitate istius mundi. Et audi quomodo. Bene stabat tanquam magister uoluptatum. Sylenum dico INFLATUM id est impletum HYACCO id est uino. Baccus dicitur Hyacus quia facit hiare uenas et turgescere. INFLATUM VENAS per synodochen id est habentem uenas impletas HYACO EXTERNO id est quod erat inflatus uino quod biberat die hesterno seu herino, quia solet dici quod una bona ebriatura durat per tres dies. Ita recte dicit Tullius in libro *Phylippicarum* de Antonio. Et dicit quod in arengo dum publice concineretur cepit emittere uinum quod biberat die preterita et epulam crudam. Vel VINO HESTERNO id est peregrino, quod est dicere quod erat ebriosus uino peregrino. Ebriosi querunt uinum peregrinum scilicet Maluasiam Vernaciam Merte.

10. A Brief Survey of Ancient Greek Philosophers

Recollectio A

Cremona 109, fol. 25r

Dicit quod iste Sillenus primo incepit canere de prima constitutione et conditione mundi. Et ut ista pars prima que cantatur a Sileno que est fortis ualde appareat clara oportet uos notare quod sicut scribit Philosophus primo *Phisicorum* antiqui philosophi habuerunt inter se magnam discrepanciam et discordiam de origine mundi. Aliqui dicebant ignem esse principium omnium rerum sicuti Eraclitus. Alius dixit quod erat aqua sicut Thales Milesius. Alii dicebant quod aer erat sicut Diogenes. Alii dicebant quod erant omnia quatuor elementa sicut Empedocles. Vlterius fuerunt alii qui dixerunt multa esse principia rerum sicuti Democritus. Dicebant quod corpora minima corpora indiuisibilia que nos communiter appellamus atomos fuerunt principia rerum. Dicebant quod ex istis atomis generabantur omnia et dicebant quod erat dare uacuum ita quod uacuum et atomos dicebant esse principia omnium rerum et dicebant quod ex istis erant facta elementa et elementata et

Recollectio B

Ottob.lat. 1262, fol. 31rb

Quid ergo canebat iste Sylenus? Hic breviter exprimit quid ipse canebat. Et dicit quod iste Sylenus incipit canere de prima constitutione mundi. Et merito debebat incipere ab illo. Et ut ista pars prima que cantatur a Syleno que est ualde fortis appareat clara oportet uos prenotare quod sicut scribit Philosophus primo *Physicorum* antiqui philosophi habuerunt inter se magnam discordiam de origine mundi. Et quomodo? Certe quia aliqui dixerunt unum esse principium omnium rerum. Et aliqui dixerant ignem esse sicuti Heraclitus qui fuit istius opinionis scilicet quod omnia generarentur ex igne. Alius dixit quod erat aqua sicut Thales Milesius primus philosophus apud Grecos ita quod uolebat quod omnia generarentur ex aqua. Alii dixerunt quod aer erat principium omnium rerum sicuti Diogenes. Alii dixerant quod erant omnia quatuor elementa scilicet ignis aqua aer et terra sicuti Empedocles. Sed tamen habebat duo alia scilicet item et concordiam. Aliquando dicebat

Recollectio C

Assisi 304, fol. 106va

Quid ergo canebat iste Silenus? Dicit breviter quod iste Silenus cepit canere de prima constitutione et origine mundi et merito debet incipere ab illa et ut ista pars prima que cantatur a Sileno que est ualde fortis appareat clara oportet uos prenotare quia sicut scribit Philosophus primo *Physicorum* dicit quod multi philosophi habuerunt inter se magnam discordiam de mundi origine. Quomodo? Aliqui dixerunt esse unum principium omnium rerum quia aliqui dixerunt ignem esse sicuti Eraclitus qui fuit istius opinionis quod omnia generarentur ex igne. Alius dixit quod erat aqua sicuti Tales Milesius primus philosophus apud Grecos ita quod uolebat quod omnia generarentur ex aqua. Alii dixerunt quod aer esset principium omnium rerum sicuti Diogenes. Alii dixerunt quod erant omnia quatuor elementa scilicet ignis aer terra et aqua sicuti Empedocles sed tamen habebat duo alia scilicet item et concordiam. Aliquando dicebat fieri chaos et aliquando omnia separari et distingui. Vlterius fuerunt

forme omnium rerum tamen distincte et quod ultimo essent facta animalia et homines. Et ideo dicebat Democritus mundum esse factum a casu et ista fuit opinio Epicuri quam iste Silenus eius sequax hic decantat.

fieri chaos, aliquando omnia separari et distingui. Vlterius fuerunt alii qui dixerunt multa esse principia rerum scilicet corpora minuta et indiuisibilia que nos communiter appellamus athamos. Ista corpora fuerunt principia rerum ita quod dabant infinita principia. Dicebant quod ex ipsis athamis fiebant omnia. Et dicebant quod erat dare uacuum contra Aristotilem. Et appellant uacuum totum spaciū in quo est iste mundus tamen aliter quia alia prius et alia deinde uolentes quod ultimo facta essent animalia et homines. Et ideo describit mundum a casu esse factum et omnia a casu preuenire. Et illa fuit opinio Epicyri.

aliqui qui dixerunt multa esse principia rerum sicuti Democritus. Quomodo? Dicebat quod fuerant infinita principia rerum scilicet corpora minuta indiuisibilia que nos communiter appellamus athamos. Ista corpora fuerant principia rerum ita quod dabant infinita principia. Dicebant quod ex ipsis athamis fiebant omnia et dicebant quod erat dare uacuum quod est contra Aristotilis dictum et appellauit [sic] uacuum totum illud spaciū mundi. Dicebant ergo quod principia rerum fuerant athomi et dicebant ex illis fieri omnes formas rerum et mundum et omnia elementa. Ista fuit opinio Democriti qui dicebat mundum esse factum a casu et a casu omnia prouenire. Ista fuit opinio Epicuri qui habuit istam opinionem quod omnia uenirent a casu.

11 A. After the Creation of the World, Dissolution by Floods, and

Regeneration by Deucalion and Pyrrha (*Eclogue 6.41*)

B. The Formation of Man by Prometheus (*Eclogue 6.42*)

Ottob. lat. 1262, fols. 31vb–32ra (cf. Cremona 109, fol. 25v; Assisi 304, fol. 107ra):

A. HI(N)C LAPIDES. Postquam tetigit constitutionem mundi nunc subannectit mundi dissolutionem. Et quomodo? Breuiter uolebant quod quandoque fieret incendium et quandoque diluuium in mundo. Et non tale quale ponit Sacra Scriptura. Et hoc concedunt philosophi particulariter et ponunt duo diluuia particularia que fuerunt in Grecia diuersis temporibus tamen scilicet tempore Deucalionis et Ogicis regis. Et dicunt quod Deucalion reparauit humanum genus cum uxore sua Pyrra. Et aliud diluuium fuit tempore Ogicis regis in Grecia. Et nunc decantabat Sylenus quod fuit tempore Deucalionis. Et hoc scribit Augustinus libro *De ciuitate Dei* (18.8). Vide

nunc dissolutionem mundi. Et canit ille Sylenus HINC id est dehinc post hoc LAPIDES PYRRE id est uxoris Deucalionis, quia projiciebant lapides post eorum terga, ut dicit fabula IACTOS pro IACTATOS. SATURNIA REGNA. Non uidetur bene dicere quia Saturnus fuit ante diluvium. Vide, potes dicere quod loquatur yronice id est quod cessauerant Saturnia regna, et ueniebat etas pessima loquendo simpliciter, quia cessabat etas aurea et ferrea ueniebat.

B. Transit ad aliam fabulam. Dixerat de constitutione mundi. Modo transit ad productionem hominis. Et ecce Virgilius secutus est istum. Habetis ab Ouidio quod post omnia fecit hominem ubi dicit “Sanctius his animal” etc. (*Metamorphoses* 1.76). Caevas fabulam, quia habetis ab Ouidio quod Prometheus fuit primus qui formauit hominem de limo terre, sed formauerat corpus inanimatum. Et tunc dicitur portatum in celum a Minerua et surripuisse modicum ignis de spera solis et ex illo spirasse uitam in homines. Et hoc est dicere quod corpus hominis est conflatum ab elementis, sed anima non est collata de potentia materie. Imo a deo producta et creata et infusa in homines. Et hoc bene consonat cum Fide, quia deus infundit animas in creaturas existentes in feto mulieris.

12 A. The Story of Tereus, Progne, and Philomena and Its Allegorization

Ottob. lat. 1262, fols. 34vb–35rb (with occasional readings of Oxford, Bodleian Library Lat. class. c.9; cf. Cremona 109, fols. 27r–28r; and Basel F V 49, fols. 27vb–28ra; Assisi 304 omits this passage):

Ecce Thereus rex fuit Tracie regionis frigide. Iste Thereus *habuit* Progne(m) in uxorem filiam regis Pandionis regis Athenarum. Et dum iret ad socerum suum Pandionem uisitandum eum rogatus fuit ab iuxore sua Progne quod quando rediret deberet ducere secum Phylomenam suam sororem, ut eam uideret. Et sic dum uellet redire domum dixit socero suo Pandioni quod Progne dixerat ei quod duceret secum cognatam scilicet filiam dicti Pandionis. Pandion fuit stultus. Et eam dedit ei. Et iste ducens eam exiuit de naui iuxta quandam siluam. Et eam uiolauit et cognouit. Ista Phylomena dixit quod omnibus panderet qualiter ipse eam uiolauerit. Vnde Thereus euulsit ei linguam. Et eam dimisit in silua. Ista uenit ad tuguria pastorum et laborauit quandam pannum artificiose in quo continebatur in scriptis totus casus enormis qui ei acciderat et misit ad ciuitatem ad sororem que erat prope ciuitatem Therei. Soror Progne uidens tenorem statim latenter recessit a ciuitate et uenit ad istam siluam. Et inuenit sororem et eam occulte duxit ad domum et in camera fecerunt complanctum. Et interim superuenit Ythis eius filius et illa furiosa in despectum mariti interfecit filium proprium et coquit eum exceptis pedibus et capite et eum dedit ad comedendum Thereo. Et dum Thereus peteret de filio ipsa dixit quod petis intus habes. Et statim Phylomena que erat in camera latens exiuit, et proiecit caput et pedes Ythis in faciem Therei. Statim Thereus uadens pro ense cucurrit post istas causa eas interficiendi. Et ipse evaserunt. HucuSque est ystoria uera. Sed ultimo est fabula scilicet quod Thereus conuersus in auem turpissimam que dicitur upupa seu bubo et illa puella conuersa est

in auem sui nominis scilicet in phylomenam et Progne in arundinem que conqueritur de infortunio sororis. Sed ultimo uideamus hic unum. Hic est pulcra moralitas. Terreus est ipsum corpus. Et bene quia corpus est terreum scilicet de terra. Pandion rex Athenarum est ipsa anima. Et patet ex nomine; "pan" grece latine totum; "dyan" grece latine clarum id est totus clarus. Ideo Pandion est anima tota clara ex dote ex excellentia nature. Ista anima habet duas filias scilicet Prognem et Phylomenam. Progne est concupiscentia. Phylomena est ratio. Progne id est prog-nata id est ante nata, quia concupiscentia est ante rationem. Et ita est quia anima prius habet concupiscentiam quam rationem. Phylomena id est dulce canens amorosa. Et ita est ratio. "Phylos" grece latine amor; "melos" id est dulcedo. Quid excellentius ratione in homine? Ergo dicit quod Progne petebat sororem, quia concupiscentia petit associari rationi. Sed Terreus id est corpus uiciat istam Phylomenam scilicet rationem. Et eripit sibi linguam, quia conductit eam ad id quod non audet loqui in tantum quod succumbit corpori. Terreus tandem conuertitur in Vpupam. Vpupa comedit turpia et ita est corpus, quia conuertitur in turpitudinem et marcat. Progne conuertitur in yrundinem. Yrundo stat in domibus. Ita concupiscentia uult stare sub tectis in cameris. Sed phylomena id est ratio petit siluas id est solitudines. Vide literam. Et ego Virgilius loquar AUT VT id est qualiter ille Sylenus NARRAVERIT ARTUS TERREI MUTATOS quia in upupam conuersus est QUAS DAPES et QUE DONA expositiue PHYLOMENA PARARIT (id est parauerit) ILLI Terreo, quia membra filii pro epulis et dapibus et caput et pedes pro donis ei obtulit. Hic uidetur alia falsitas, quia Phylomena non fuit que parauit cibum ei. Imo Progne. Vide Virgilius uult dicere quod ipsa fuit causa totius istius mortis et epularum datarum ei Terreo. ET QUO VERSU [CURSU] Phylomena PETIVERIT DESERTA id est siluas. ET QUIBUS ALIIS [ALIS]. INFELIX Progne. Hoc refer ad Prognem VOL-TAVERIT id est frequenter uolauerit SUPER TECTA id est domos, quia in domibus manent irundines.

B. The Myth of Tereus According to Ciones (Zonus) de Magnalis

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 5990, fol. 76ra-b:

AUT VT MUTARES [sic] ALIA FABULA. Cum Pandyan rex Athenarum obsideretur a barbaris Terreus rex Tracie iuuit eum. Cuius causa dedit sibi Prognem filiam suam in uxorem Terreo. Qui Terreus cum stetisset per aliquod tempus uoluit ire uisum sacerum. Et Prognes rogauit eum ut duceret secum Phylomenam sororem suam quia libenter uideret eam. Et sic iuit. Et cum uidisset Phylomenam adeo formosam amor auxit preces. Et sic pater inuite concessit ei ut duceret eam. Qui cum esset in quodam loco sibi apto ea repugnante uiciauit eam. Et cum ipsa clamans diceret quod istud narraret, amputauit sibi linguam ne hec dicere posset. Admisit eam custodiendam quibusdam suis pastoribus. Et redibat ad eam quando uolebat. Et hec composuit telam in qua enarrauit totum infortunium suum siue casum sorori. Et innuit cuidam uilice ut portaret illam telam ad Prognem. Quo scito Prognes simulauit sacrificium Bachi. Et iuit et abstulit eam et duxit domum secum. Et cum sibi occurreret Ytis filius Prognes sibi blandiens dixit: "O tu eris similis patri tuo."

Et interfecerunt puerum. Et reseruato capite fecerunt pulmentum de puer. Et simulauerunt festa in quibus soli mariti debent interesse. Et cum Terreus comederet et cibus saperet sibi, optans quod filius haberet de tali cibo, dixit: "Ubi est Ytis?" Cui respondit: "Quod extra petis intus habes." Et Philomena uenit cum capite pueri et proiecit contra ipsum. Tunc Terreus motus uesania persecutus est eas et conuerte sunt in aues. Et ipse Terreus conuersus est in auem scilicet upupam cristatam que uestitur stercore. Et Ytis conuersus est in fasianum. Mutatio fuit quia ipse aufugerunt et Phylomena latuit in siluis et Prognes in domo. Et ob hoc irundines in domibus habitant. Et Ytis mutatus est in fasianum quia comestus in modum fasiani. Pandyon interpretatur "tota claritas" et hec est anima nostra que de se et clara est. Et habet duas filias scilicet Prognem et Phylomenam id est "concupiscentiam" et "rationem." Prognes dicitur a "prothos" quod est primum. Phylomena interpretatur "ratio" et dicitur a "phylos" quod est amor et "mene" quod est defectus quia ratio sine defectu est. Per Terreum intelligit "extremum corpus" siue amores terrenorum quia homo est ex anima et corpore. Per Terreum intelligitur corpus et per Prognem concupiscentia que est ab anima et optat iungi ad Phylomenam id est rationem et Terreus id est corpus uiciat eam licet ratio suffragetur in quantum potest. Sed corpus amputat linguam quia amputat eam. Sed ratio reuertata ad conscientiam sed concupiscentia conscientia opponuntur. Sed conuertuntur quia beatus assendunt ad celum quasi per modum volantium. AUT ille canit VT id est qualiter Terreus mutatus fuit in auem spurcissimam quia corpus conuertitur in rem fetidam. PHYLOSOPIAM quia nichil dulcius ratione. PROGNES lugubris quia concupiscentia per contritionem efficitur lugubris. PHILOMENA dapes etc. ponitur pro Progne quia sic utitur quandoque uno nomine pro alio. Sicut quandoque ponitur Polus [sic] pro Castore, et potest esse quod Philomena similiter cum Progne ponitur. Dapes DESERTA scilicet loca PETIERIT, quia DESERTA TERRA SUA ANTE etc.

C. The Myth of Tereus According to Anselm of Laon

London, British Library, Add. 33220, fol. 5ra:

AUT VT MUTATOS, quasi diceret: Quid dicam qualiter Sillenus cecinit de mutacione Terei de quo legitur in fabulis: quod Philomenam uxoris sue Progne sororem incestauit? Et ne quod ei fecerat narraret, linquam eius abscidit, que denique telam casus suos inscriptos habentem sorori sue transmisit; quibus cognitis Progne in ultionem sororis sue et sui ipsius Thereo marito suo Ytim filium suum proprium comedendum apposuit; quod cum ille intellexit, eam furibundus inuasit. Sed Progne in hirundinem conversa est, Thereus in huppam, id est in epopem, quod idem est epos, epopis, Philomena in luciniam, id est in runcolam, Ytis autem in phasiam.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.



PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

ISBN Prefix: 0-88844-

Series Codes

EGS Etienne Gilson Series
MST Mediaeval Sources in Translation
PMS Papers in Mediaeval Studies

SM Subsidia Mediaevalia
ST Studies and Texts
TMLT Toronto Mediaeval Latin Texts

Recent Publications

Amstutz, Renate. **Ludus de decem virginibus. Recovery of the Sung Liturgical Core of the Thuringian Zehnjungfrauenspiel.** ST 140. 2002; xxxvi, 412 pp.; 1 fishe. Casebound. ISBN -140-1. \$89.95

A study of the Latin elements of the fourteenth-century Ten-Virgins Play from Thuringia, with a reconstruction of the words and music of the Latin chants.

Boyle, Leonard E. **A Survey of the Vatican Archives and of Its Medieval Holdings.** SM 1. Revised edition. 2001; x, 250 pp. ISBN -417-6. \$29.95

This guide is an introduction to one of the world's most remarkable historical resources. This second edition is updated with cross-references to *Vatican Archives*, by Francis X. Blouin et al., and to the recent publications found there that supplement the original text of the *Survey*.

A British Book of Kings, 1200 BC – 1399 AD. Edited by A. G. Rigg. TMLT 26. 2000; viii, 112 pp. ISBN -476-1. \$7.95

Edited from British Library MSS Harley 3860, Cotton Claudius D. vii, and Harley 1808. Texts that recount the history of Britain from its legendary foundation by Brutus in 1200 BC to the fall of Richard II in 1399 AD.

Burley, Walter. **Quaestiones super librum Posteriorum.** Edited by Mary Catherine Sommers. ST 136. 2000; x, 214 pp. Casebound. ISBN -136-3. \$39.95

An edition of Burley's twelve Questions on Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*, probably connected with his teaching as part of the arts curriculum and organized around themes of Aristotelian scientific method; with an introduction to the author and his work and an extensive index.

Capgrave, John. **Life of Augustine.** Edited from British Library Additional MS 36704, together with Jordanus of Saxony's *Vita s. Augustini* from Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal MS 251, by Cyril Lawrence Smetana. ST 138. 2001; x, 138 pp. Casebound. ISBN -138-2. \$33.95

This edition of a unique Middle English manuscript written about 1451 provides a diplomatic transcription of the text, expanding Capgrave's abbreviations, and includes modern punctuation, capitalization, word division, and paragraph breaks.

PUBLICATIONS

Charters, Cartularies, and Archives: The Preservation and Transmission of Documents in the Medieval West. Proceedings of a Colloquium of the Commission Internationale de Diplomatique (Princeton and New York, 16–18 September 1999). Edited by Adam J. Kosto and Anders Winroth. PMS 17. 2002; x, 186 pp. ISBN -817-1. \$34.95

These papers, ranging over a wide chronological and geographic scope, focus on various ways in which charters were preserved, copied, and transmitted.

Chatton, Walter. Reportatio super Sententias. Liber I, distinctiones 1-9. Edited by Joseph C. Wey and Girard J. Etzkorn. ST 141. 2002; xvi, 580 pp. Casebound. ISBN -141-X \$95.95

—. **Reportatio super Sententias. Liber I, distinctiones 10-48.** Edited by Joseph C. Wey and Girard J. Etzkorn. ST 142. 2002; xiv, 502 pp. Casebound. ISBN -142-8 \$95.00

These two volumes continue the critical edition of Chatton's masterwork on the *Sentences*. The text is amplified with notes documenting Chatton's sources and his relation to his opponents.

The Chronicle of Zuqnīn, Parts III and IV, A.D. 488–775. Translated from the Syriac with notes and introduction by Amir Harrak. MST 36. 1999; xviii, 388 pp. ISBN -286-6. \$37.50

A west Syrian chronicle, preserving much of the lost part of John of Ephesus's *Ecclesiastical History*, as well as detailed information on the seventh and eighth centuries under the early 'Abbāsid caliphs.

Cogs, Cargoes, and Commerce: Maritime Bulk Trade in Northern Europe 1150–1400. Edited by Lars Berggren, Nils Hybel and Annette Landen. PMS 15. 2002; xxii, 286 pp. ISBN -815-5. \$39.95

Nine papers study various aspects of and shed new light on the trade in bulk goods (e.g., beer, timber, stone, grain) around Northern Europe during a period of substantial economic growth.

Dodd, Erica Cruikshank. With James Martin, John J. C. McCullough, Kassem Toueir, and Nicholas Zammuto. The Frescoes of Mar Musa al-Habashi: A Study in Medieval Painting in Syria. ST 139. 2001; xxii, 204 pp.; 25 colour plates, 158 black-and-white plates; 8 line drawings. Casebound. ISBN -139-8. \$89.00

The book relates the history of the monastery through the Middle Ages and presents a detailed study of the paintings and inscriptions in the church, including those uncovered recently by the Istituto del Restauro.

Gilson, Etienne. Thomism: The Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas. Translated by †Laurence K. Shook and Armand Maurer. EGS 24. 2002; xvi, 454 pp.; Casebound. ISBN -724-8. \$74.95

The six editions of Gilson's study devoted to the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas cover much of the scholarly life of their author. His revised sixth and final edition, published in 1965 and here put into English for the first time, presents his thoughts on the subject with new clarity and precision.

Guerric of Saint-Quentin. Quaestiones de quolibet. Edited by †Walter H. Principe, with Editorial Revision and a Preface by Jonathan Black. Introduction by Jean-Pierre Torrell. ST 143. 2002; xxxvi, 463 pp. Casebound. ISBN -143-6. \$84.95

The nine Quodlibets and fragments of five others attributed to this early Dominican master are among the earliest known quodlibetal questions. They are presented with an introduction (in French) examining the various theological subjects in the Latin text.

PUBLICATIONS

Hervaeus Natalis. **The Poverty of Christ and the Apostles.** Translated by John D. Jones. MST 37 / Studies in Medieval Moral Teaching 2. 1999; x, 174 pp. ISBN -287-4. \$28.95

Hervaeus's work provides a comprehensive and rigorous analysis of the central philosophical, theological, and scriptural themes at the heart of the fourteenth-century controversy over the Franciscan doctrine of the "absolute" poverty of Christ and the apostles.

Maurer, Armand. **The Philosophy of William of Ockham in the Light of Its Principles.** ST 133. 1999; x, 590 pp. ISBN -416-8. \$44.95
Casebound. ISBN -133-9. \$85.00

A comprehensive and detailed study of the logic, epistemology, and relation of philosophy to theology in the writings of William of Ockham.

McGeer, Eric. **The Land Legislation of the Macedonian Emperors.** MST 38. 2000; xii, 146 pp. ISBN -88-2. \$22.95

Fourteen legal decrees issued by the Macedonian Emperors that constitute the most important source for the internal history of tenth-century Byzantium. Translation, commentary, maps, glossary, bibliography.

The Necrology of San Nicola della Cicogna (Montecassino, Archivio della Badia 179, pp. 1-64). Edited by Charles Hilken. ST 135 / Monumenta Liturgica Beneventana 2. 2000; x, 178 pp. Casebound. ISBN -135-5. \$34.95

An edition and study of a necrology from a dependency of Montecassino. This record of death anniversaries gives insights not only into the community itself but into its relation to the larger Beneventan brotherhood as well as to its secular neighbors.

Religion, Text, and Society in Medieval Spain and Northern Europe: Essays in Honor of J.N. Hillgarth. Edited by Thomas E. Burns, Mark D. Meyerson, and Leah Shopkow. PMS 16. 2002; xx, 374 pp. Casebound. ISBN -816-3. \$84.95

Seventeen essays on the history of medieval Spain, Ramon Lull, and the history of Christianity and its institutional practices.

Reynolds, Roger E. **The Collectio canonum Casinensis duodecimi saeculi (Codex terscriptus).** A derivative of the South-Italian *Collection in Five Books*. An implicit edition with introductory study. ST 137; Monumenta Liturgica Beneventana 3. 2001; x, 129 pp. Casebound. ISBN -137-1. \$31.95

This twelfth-century collection of ecclesiastical law reflects reforming trends of both the Ottonian and Salian emperors of the early eleventh century and the so-called Gregorian reformers from the later eleventh century.

Walter of Châtillon. **Saints' Lives: Brendan, Alexis, Thomas Becket.** Edited by Carsten Wollin. TMLT 27. 2002; viii, 104 pp. ISBN -477-X. \$7.95

These three poetic saints' lives were written anonymously but ascribed to Walter of Châtillon (ca. 1130-1200) because of their stylistic features.

Wolf, Kirsten, ed. **The Old Norse-Icelandic Legend of Saint Barbara.** ST 134. 2000; x, 188 pp. Casebound. ISBN -134-7. \$39.95

An edition (diplomatic and normalized) of the Old Norse-Icelandic legend of Saint Barbara extant in Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket Perg. 2 fol. from ca. 1425-1445 and also in Copenhagen, Det arnmaagnæanske Institut AM 429 12mo from ca. 1500.

PUBLICATIONS

MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

An annual journal of scholarship on the Middle Ages

Volumes 1-58 (1939-1996)	per volume \$40.00
Volumes 59-64 (1997-2002)	per volume \$75.00
Volumes 1-60 (1939-1998) (including indexes)	set \$870.00
General Index, volumes 1-25 (1939-1963) ISBN -625-X.	\$11.00
First Supplement Index, volumes 26-30 (1964-1968) ISBN -631-4.	\$3.00
Second Supplement Index, volumes 31-40 (1969-1978) ISBN -648-9.	\$12.00

A full listing of our currently available publications can be found at our website:

<http://www.pims.ca>

or write to us for a catalogue

Department of Publications
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
59 Queen's Park Crescent East
Toronto, Ontario, Canada MSS 2C4
telephone: 416-926-7143
facsimile: 416-926-7258

All correspondence regarding submissions should be addressed to

Jonathan Black, Ph.D.
Managing Editor
Mediaeval Studies
59 Queen's Park Crescent East
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5S 2C4

Electronic Mail:
jonathan.black@utoronto.ca

Mediaeval Studies does not accept books for review.

Prospective authors must submit three copies of all materials, including photocopies of manuscript sources. Text and endnotes must be double-spaced. *Mediaeval Studies* conforms to *The Chicago Manual of Style* but omits publishers' names in citations.

English and French are the primary languages of *Mediaeval Studies*, but articles in other languages will be considered.

Mediaeval Studies accepte des articles rédigés en anglais et en français et, exceptionnellement, en autres langues.

Additional information, including a description of the journal and a list of the contents of the most recent volumes, is available at the website of the Pontifical Institute of *Mediaeval Studies*: <http://www.pims.ca>

All correspondence regarding orders and subscriptions should be addressed to

Ron B. Thomson, D. Phil.
Director of Publications
59 Queen's Park Crescent East
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5S 2C4

Electronic Mail:
pontifex@chass.utoronto.ca

Subscription \$75.00 yearly. All back issues are still available.